













A CONCISE  
HISTORY OF ITALY



LUIGI SALVATORELLI

---

A CONCISE  
HISTORY OF ITALY

FROM PREHISTORIC TIMES  
TO  
OUR OWN DAY

---

*Translated by Bernard Miall*

---

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS  
NEW YORK



# CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. <i>FROM PREHISTORIC TIMES TO THE ROMAN CONQUEST</i>	13
§1. GEOLOGICAL FORMATION AND GEOGRAPHICAL CONDITIONS (p. 13). §2. THE PRIMITIVE CIVILIZATION. THE VARIOUS INHABITANTS (p. 14). §3. ITALIAN ETHNOGRAPHY. GREEK AND ETRUSCAN CULTURES (p. 18). §4. ETRUSCAN EXPANSION AND THE FIRST EXPANSION OF ROME. GREEKS, CARTHAGINIANS AND ITALICI (p. 21). §5. THE INTERNAL POLITICAL LIFE OF ROME BEFORE THE PUNIC WARS (p. 25). §6. THE ROMAN HEGEMONY OVER LATIUM (p. 28). §7. THE CONQUEST OF PENINSULAR ITALY (p. 30). §8. ORGANIZATION OF ROMAN ITALY (p. 33).	
II. <i>ROMAN ITALY TO THE FALL OF THE EMPIRE</i>	38
§9. ROMAN ITALY IN THE EPOCH OF THE PUNIC WARS. THE CONQUEST OF NORTHERN ITALY (p. 38). §10. INTERNAL TRANSFORMATIONS OF ROMANO-ITALIC SOCIETY. CULTURE (p. 41). §11. THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CRISIS. AGRARIAN LAWS AND ITALIC UNREST (p. 44). §12. THE SOCIAL WAR AND THE FIRST CIVIL WAR. THE MUNICIPAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE ROMAN STATE (p. 46). §13. THE NEW CIVIL WARS AND THE INSTITUTION OF THE EMPIRE. THE AGE OF AUGUSTUS (p. 49). §14. ITALY IN THE FIRST TWO CENTURIES OF THE EMPIRE (p. 54). §15. THE LATE EMPIRE. ITALY REDUCED TO THE STATUS OF PROVINCE. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE PAPACY (p. 59).	
III. <i>OSTROGOTHS AND BYZANTINES</i>	67
§16. ODOACER AND THEODORIC (p. 67). §17. THEODORIC (p. 69). §18. RELATIONS WITH THE EMPIRE AND THE FRANKS. THE CRISIS OF THE REGIME (p. 74). §19. THE IMPERIAL RECONQUEST OF ITALY (p. 77). §20. ITALY UNDER BYZANTINE ADMINISTRATION (p. 80). §21. THE SCHISM OF THE THREE CHAPTERS. BENEDICTINE MONASTICISM (p. 84).	
IV. <i>BYZANTINE AND LOMBARD ITALY</i>	89
§22. THE LOMBARD INVASION AND THE DIVISION OF ITALY (p. 89). §23. CONDITIONS IN LOMBARD AND BYZANTINE ITALY. THE ROMAN CHURCH (p. 94). §24. THE TEMPORAL POWER AND THE END OF BYZANTINE AND LOMBARD RULE (p. 100).	



**V. FRANKISH ITALY, THE FEUDAL ANARCHY,  
AND THE ROMANO-GERMANIC EMPIRE**

106

§25. CHARLEMAGNE AND THE POPES. THE NEW EMPIRE OF THE WEST (p. 106). §26. THE FRANKISH ORGANIZATION. FEUDALISM (p. 111). §27. ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL CONDITIONS (p. 114). §28. LOUIS II. THE MUSULMANS IN THE SOUTH (p. 117). §29. THE LAST OF THE CAROLINGIANS. THE FULL DEVELOPMENT OF FEUDALISM (p. 121). §30. THE "INDEPENDENT ITALIC KINGDOM" (p. 128). §31. THE ROMANO-GERMANIC EMPIRE (p. 133).

**VI. THE FIRST CONFLICT BETWEEN PAPACY  
AND EMPIRE AND THE NORMANS IN THE  
SOUTH**

138

§32. NEW FORMATIONS IN LOMBARDY AND THE SOUTH (p. 138). §33. THE ECCLESIASTICAL REFORMS AND THE WAR OF INVESTITURES (p. 144). §34. ECCLESIASTICAL CONDITIONS. THE FIRST CRUSADE. CHIVALRY (p. 153).

**VII. THE COMMUNES AND THE KINGDOM**

158

§35. DECADENCE AND RECOVERY OF THE CITIES (p. 158). §36. THE FORMATION OF THE COMMUNE AND ITS INSTITUTIONS (p. 163). §37. THE COMMUNES IN CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN ITALY. VENICE (p. 168). §38. THE NEW CULTURE (p. 171). §39. THE KINGDOM OF SICILY (p. 175). §40. THE COMMUNE OF ROME (p. 178). §41. THE IMPERIAL REVOLUTION OF FREDERICK BARBAROSSA (p. 180). §42. THE COALITION AGAINST THE EMPIRE. LEGNANO (p. 185). §43. THE DISBANDING OF THE COALITION. THE SWABIANS IN SICILY (p. 190).

**VIII. GUELF AND GHIBELLINES, NOBLES AND  
PEOPLE**

195

§44. INNOCENT III (p. 195). §45. COMMUNAL DEVELOPMENTS (p. 198). §46. ITALIAN MULTIPLICITY AND UNITY (p. 203). §47. ARTS AND LETTERS IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE 13TH CENTURY (p. 207). §48. THE UNIVERSITIES AND THE INFLUENCE OF ARISTOTLE (p. 211). §49. RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS. HERESIES, THE FRANCISCAN MOVEMENT, AND THE MENDICANT ORDERS (p. 214). §50. ITALY IN THE MEDITERRANEAN (p. 222). §51. FREDERICK II (p. 227). §52. THE LAST OF THE SWABIANS AND THE COMING OF THE ANGEVINS (p. 233).

## CONTENTS

CHAPTER

PAGE

### IX. *THE PAPACY, THE ANGEVINS, AND THE SIGNORIE*

238

§53. THE BEGINNING OF THE SIGNORIE (p. 238). §54. THE IMPERIALISTIC POLICY OF CHARLES OF ANJOU (p. 242). §55. THE WAR OF THE VESPERS AND THE SEPARATION OF NAPLES AND SICILY (p. 245). §56. LOMBARDY AND TUSCANY (p. 248). §57. VENICE AND GENOA (p. 252). §58. BONIFACE VIII. THE PAPACY IN AVIGNON (p. 255). §59. THE LAST INTERVENTIONS OF THE EMPIRE (p. 258). §60. THE TRIUMPH OF ITALIAN PARTICULARISM (p. 265).

### X. *THE VISCONTI, FLORENCE, AND THE PAPACY*

272

§61. THE CHARACTER OF THE SIGNORIE (p. 272). §62. THE "COMPAGNIE DI VENTURA" (p. 275). §63. THE APOGEE OF THE COMMUNAL CIVILIZATION (p. 277). §64. THE VISCONTI AND THE ANTI-VISCONTEAN COALITIONS (p. 286). §65. THE ADVENTURE OF COLA DI RIENZO AND THE TEMPORAL RECONSTRUCTION OF THE PAPAL DOMINION (p. 291). §66. THE POPES, THE VISCONTI, AND FLORENCE. THE RETURN OF THE PAPACY AND THE GREAT SCHISM (p. 297). §67. INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENTS OF THE VARIOUS ITALIAN STATES (p. 304).

### XI. *FINAL FORMATION AND CONFLICTS OF THE ITALIAN PRINCIPALITIES*

312

§68. THE HEGEMONY OF GIAN GALEAZZO (p. 312). §69. THE CRISIS OF THE VISCONTEAN STATE (p. 315). §70. EXPANSION OF THE KINGDOM OF NAPLES. SICILY AND ARAGON (p. 318). §71. THE RECONSTITUTION OF THE VISCONTEAN PRINCIPALITY AND THE WARS WITH VENICE AND FLORENCE (p. 322). §72. THE CRISIS IN THE CHURCH AND THE PAPAL POLICY. THE CONTEST FOR THE KINGDOM OF NAPLES (p. 324). §73. COSIMO DI MEDICI, ALFONSO OF ARAGON, AND FRANCESCO SFORZA (p. 330). §74. FRANCESCO SFORZA, DUKE OF MILAN. THE PEACE OF LODI (p. 333).

### XII. *THE BALANCE OF POWER—THE RENAISSANCE*

337

§75. ITALY AFTER THE PEACE OF LODI (p. 337). §76. ITALY AND THE OTTOMAN TURKS (p. 339). §77. THE WAR OF JOHN OF ANJOU AND THE NEW GENERATION OF PRINCES (p. 341). §78. THE CONSPIRACY OF THE PAZZI, THE WAR WITH FERRARA, AND THE CONSPIRACY OF THE BARONS (p. 344). §79. CULTURE AND SPIRIT OF THE RENAISSANCE (p. 348). §80. ECONOMIC CONDITIONS. GEOGRAPHICAL DISCOVERIES (p. 358).

**XIII. THE FOREIGN INVASIONS**

363

§81. ITALY AND THE GREAT POWERS (p. 363). §82. CHARLES VIII IN ITALY. GEROLAMO SAVONAROLA (p. 365). §83. LOUIS XII AND THE BORGIA. MILAN TO FRANCE, NAPLES TO SPAIN (p. 370). §84. THE LEAGUE OF CAMBRAI (p. 375). §85. FRANCIS I AND CHARLES V. THE SUBJECTION OF ITALY TO THE EMPEROR (p. 379). §86. THE APOGEE OF THE RENAISSANCE (p. 385).

**XIV. REFORMATION AND COUNTER-REFORMATION.  
THE PAPACY AND THE EMPIRE RULE ITALY** 396

§87. THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE PAPACY AND THE EMPIRE, AND THE REFORMATION IN ITALY (p. 396). §88. FINAL RESISTANCE TO THE SUPREMACY OF THE HABSBURGS IN ITALY. THE PEACE OF CATEAU-CAMBRÉSIS (p. 401). §89. THE COUNCIL OF TRENT AND THE COUNTER-REFORMATION (p. 408). §90. THE BATTLE OF LEPANTO (p. 412).

**XV. ITALY UNDER THE SPANISH DOMINATION** 415

§91. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PERIOD. CONDITIONS IN THE SPANISH STATES (p. 415). §92. VENICE, ROME, TUSCANY, GENOA (p. 419). §93. PIEDMONT (p. 429). §94. RESUMPTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL POLICY OF CHARLES EMMANUEL I (p. 432). §95. INDIVIDUAL QUARRELS BETWEEN ITALIAN STATES. REVOLT IN NAPLES AND PALERMO (p. 438). §96. THE CULTURE OF THE COUNTER-REFORMATION AND THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY (p. 443). §97. THE ITALIAN POLICY OF LOUIS XIV. VICTOR AMEDEUS II (p. 450). §98. THE COLLAPSE OF THE SPANISH DOMINION. THE SAVOYARD KINGDOM (p. 453).

**XVI. THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY**

458

§99. THE BOURBONS IN ITALY. THE NEW POLITICAL ORDER IN THE PENINSULA (p. 458). §100. THE EUROPEAN CULTURE OF THE "AUFKLÄRUNG" (p. 463). §101. THE REVIVAL OF ITALIAN CULTURE (p. 471). §102. THE REFORMIST MOVEMENT IN EUROPE. ITALY DURING THE PERIOD OF THE REFORMS (p. 479).

# CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
XVII.	<i>FROM THE REVOLUTION TO THE RESTORATION</i>	489
	§103. REACTIONARIES AND JACOBINS. THE FRENCH IN ITALY AND THE ITALIAN REPUBLICS (p. 489). §104. NAPOLEONIC ITALY (p. 498). §105. THE FALL OF THE NAPOLEONIC REGIME. THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA AND THE HOLY ALLIANCE (p. 504). §106. THE RESTORATION AND THE LIBERAL MOVEMENT (p. 510).	
XVIII.	<i>THE RISORGIMENTO</i>	520
	§107. THE ITALIAN REVOLUTIONS OF 1820-1821 (p. 520). §108. THE REACTION. THE TRIALS IN LOMBARDY-VENETIA AND THE SPIELBERG (p. 525). §109. THE REVOLUTION OF 1831 IN CENTRAL ITALY (p. 528). §110. GIUSEPPE MAZZINI AND "YOUNG ITALY" (p. 533). §111. THE MODERATE PARTY. ITALIAN CULTURE OF THE RISORGIMENTO (p. 539). §112. CHARLES ALBERT AND PIUS IX. THE REFORMS (p. 546). §113. THE REVOLUTION OF 1848 AND THE WAR WITH AUSTRIA (p. 550). §114. CRISIS AT HOME AND WAR ABROAD. NOVARA. THE SIEGES OF ROME AND OF VENICE. THE TRIUMPH OF AUSTRIA AND THE REACTION (p. 555).	
XIX.	<i>THE FORMATION OF THE UNITARY STATE</i>	561
	§115. ITALY FROM 1849 TO 1859 (p. 561). §116. THE WAR OF 1859 AND THE ANNEXATION OF EMILIA AND TUSCANY (p. 567). §117. THE EXPEDITION OF THE THOUSAND AND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE KINGDOM OF ITALY (p. 572). §118. VENICE AND ROME (p. 575).	
XX.	<i>ITALY SINCE 1870</i>	585
	§119. THE UNITARY ITALIAN STATE (p. 585). §120. THE PARTIES. THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RIGHT (p. 588). §121. THE LEFT IN POWER. <u>TRANSFORMISM</u> . TUNIS AND THE TRIPLE ALLIANCE (p. 591). §122. <u>ITALIAN CULTURE</u> IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE 19TH CENTURY (p. 597). §123. THE PERIOD OF CRISPI (p. 602). §124. THE REACTION AND THE LIBERAL REGIME. ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL EVOLUTION (p. 606). §125. THE GIOLITTIAN PERIOD. TRIPOLI (p. 613). §126. THE WAR (p. 616). §127. FASCISM (p. 620).	
	<i>BIBLIOGRAPHY</i>	631
	<i>INDEX OF NAMES</i>	665



## CHAPTER I

### *FROM PREHISTORIC TIMES TO THE ROMAN CONQUEST*

§ 1. GEOLOGICAL FORMATION AND GEOGRAPHICAL CONDITIONS.—The Italian peninsula is a formation of the Tertiary period. By the first of the four epochs of this period (the Eocene) the whole circle of the Alps was already in its place—having been formed in the depths of the seas in the earliest geological ages—and also some portions of the Peninsular region, constituting a series of archipelagos. These being joined together by repeated emergences, in the Pliocene (the last epoch of the Tertiary period) the Alpine-Appennine ossature of Italy was already formed, but enormous areas, like that of the plain of the Po, were still submerged. In the Quaternary period volcanic eruptions and glacial phenomena created the plains. To the glacial epoch succeeded our modern climate, and the existing flora and fauna.

The Italian peninsula is the central one of the three great Mediterranean peninsulas. It lies between  $7^{\circ}$  and  $18^{\circ}$  east longitude and  $46^{\circ}$  and  $38^{\circ}$  north latitude. Long and narrow, it extends from the north-west to the south-east for a distance of some 750 miles. Its terrestrial frontier measures about 1,250 miles; its coast-line about 5,300. This long coast-line, however, is less broken and less rich in harbours than that of the Greek peninsula. Italy, while the continental portion of the country is joined on to Central Europe, nearly reaches Africa with this peninsula and its prolongation into Sicily (once joined to the mainland). Its eastern coast is in close proximity to the Balkan peninsula—that is, to the Orient—but it is much farther removed from the Iberian peninsula, although with Sardinia and Corsica it reaches out in a westerly direction. The continental portion is a great rectangular plain, which facilitates communications and commerce, and favours the concentration of human intercourse about certain important centres. In this peninsula, which is extremely elongated, so that reference to the centre

is not easy, there is only a restricted area between the Apennines and the sea, especially on the side of the Adriatic, to which the mountains approach more closely. The buttresses of the Apennines add to the difficulty of communications, and increase the isolation of the individual provinces, while the rivers, above all those of the eastern watershed, are mostly of no great length, of little importance, and torrential in character.

The Alps constitute a definite frontier between Italy and the rest of Europe. Numerous transversal breaches afford means of communication between the peninsula and the continent in the north, north-east and north-west; but the internal slope of the Alps is more precipitous than the external, so that it is easier to cross them from north to south than from south to north; that is, it is easier to invade Italy from without than to invade the contiguous regions from Italy.

§ 2. THE PRIMITIVE CIVILIZATION. THE VARIOUS INHABITANTS. The earliest reliable evidence hitherto discovered of human life in Italy, which was found in the neighbourhood of Otranto, relates to the earliest ages of the Palaeolithic era (that is, the age of roughly worked stone implements). The inhabitants of Italy then lived in caves and were surrounded by the great pachyderms (elephant, hippopotamus and rhinoceros), which subsequently became extinct in Europe. Of the first Palaeolithic era (the lower Palaeolithic) traces may be found in almost all parts of Italy (but their occurrence in the islands has not been verified). Among these relics are the Sacco-pastore skull, discovered not far from Rome: a skull of *homo primigenius*, or the Neanderthal type of man, still far removed from the existing types, being much more nearly related to the anthropoid apes. But a superior type already makes its appearance with the cranium discovered at Olmo, near Arezzo.

The Upper Palaeolithic appears in the three regions of Italy (Northern, Central and Southern), and in the islands; especially interesting remains having been found in the neighbourhood of Otranto (the Romanelli caves) and the extreme west of Liguria (the Grimaldi caves), where we find not only paleoliths, but also bone implements, *graffiti* and rock paintings, and traces of a cult of the dead. So far there

was no ceramic art. The Grimaldi man was negroid in type (*homo niger*); but we also find traces, in this period, of a superior race of the Cro-Magnon type (*homo priscus*) and a third race, the Maiella man, which was one of the earliest Mediterranean types.

The following era, the Neolithic (the age of polished stone implements) was an era of great progress both in the whole peninsula and in the islands. Its beginnings coincided with the origins of pastoral life and ceramics, which were probably introduced by invading populations. We now find various dolicocephalic and brachycephalic (long-headed and short-headed) types: that is, a mingling of races. Among the ancient peoples of Italy of whom we have literary record the Neolithic culture would seem to correspond with the Ligurian race, and it is supposed that in the prehistoric era this race must have spread over a great part of Italy. According to some writers the Ligurians are akin to the Siculi, the inhabitants of Sicily at a later period, and according to others to the Elimi, the earliest inhabitants of that island. Some would assign this Ligurian people to the so-called Mediterranean race, but as we have already noted, it proceeded rather from a mingling of races.

Deposits of the true Neolithic era are rather scarce in Italy; at a very early period the implements of polished stone are found together with articles of bronze or copper, belonging to the so-called Aëneolithic era, or, as some prefer to say, the Late Copper Age. We now find a developed industry, producing articles of stone, copper, and bone together with painted pottery, which reveals artistic tendencies. The religious cult is also more developed. Deposits of this period are found throughout the peninsula and in the three great islands. In Apulia are found those peculiar megalithic monuments known as dolmens (horizontal slabs on vertical supports). In Sardinia the *nuraghi* made their appearance (fortress-towers, in shape a truncated cone with a domed roof), and they continued throughout the Bronze Age and into historical times. As habitations, the caves were replaced by huts which were grouped together in villages, and enclosed within stone walls and defensive trenches. The tombs also were grouped together in burial-grounds. Commercial activity was intensified, and the mineral deposits began to be worked. Ornamentation was further developed, and the



plastic arts made their appearance. The archaeologists in general believe that the race which inhabited Italy during the preceding period continued to inhabit it during the Late Copper Age. De Sanctis, on the other hand, attributes the Aëneolithic culture to the advent of the Aryan peoples—that is, to the Italici—who from this time onwards are believed to have spread throughout the peninsula. These Proto-Italics are supposed to have included the Siculi and Sicani, in Sicily; the Umbro-Sabelli, who are thought to have occupied the valley of the Po and Etruria, between the non-Italic Euganeans on the north-east and the Ligurians in the north-west; and the Latins, with their kinsfolk, who are believed to have inhabited the whole of Southern Italy, from the Ciminian Mountains to the Strait of Messina. During the Aëneolithic age a new type of habitation made its appearance in Northern Italy: the pile or lake dwelling, a house supported on piles, with an earthen floor and platform, built on the shore of a lake, or surrounded by water. The pile-dwelling survived into the Bronze Age, but in this period the analogous habitation known as the *terramara*<sup>1</sup> became the predominating type, which was built on marshy soil at some distance from the water. This type of dwelling was derived from the former, but it was much more highly developed, and it was built in large, regular groups which were really embryo towns. The inhabitants of the pile dwellings of *terramare* practised agriculture, moulded a new sort of pottery, and cremated their dead, instead of burying them as their predecessors had done. They were a new people, who had come from the North across the central and eastern Alps, and they have generally been identified as the Italici. But even those who accept this identification find that the archaeological records of stocks which were more definitely Italic reveal the continuation of the Neo-Aëneolithic culture, with the practice of burying the dead. As against the identification of these people with the Italici, there is another theory, propounded by De Sanctis, which is somewhat hazardous, and subject to serious objections; namely, that they were Etruscans. They are believed to have descended upon Italy from the Rhaetian Alps. The Etruscan cities appear to have developed the preceding form of the *terramare*; and

<sup>1</sup> So called from the earth found in mounds on the site of these settlements, which is in demand as a fertilizer. (Tr.)

there seem to have been singular analogies in the foundation rites of the two types of community. Under the pressure of the Etruscans the Osco-Umbrians are believed to have moved on towards the south of the peninsula.

The Bronze Age was followed by the Iron Age. This was represented on Italian soil by a series of settlements, from Piedmont to Apulia. Particularly important were the settlements of the "Villanovan" culture, so called from a place of this name in the neighbourhood of Bologna, where a representative sepulchre of this period was discovered. This culture existed in Emilia, Tuscany and Umbria, and four phases may be distinguished, extending from the first half of the 9th century to the close of the 6th. And so we come to historical times. The peoples of the Villanovan culture and the other northern groups of the Iron Age burned their dead; but yet other groups, to the south of Picenum, buried them. To the west of the Apennines the Villanovan culture extended to Latium, on the north side of the Tiber, while on the south of the Tiber we find another type of Iron Age culture, known as the "Latian," which at first cremated the dead, but afterwards practised both cremation and burial. The tombs of this Latian civilization are found in Rome on the Palatine, the Esquiline, and the Quirinal, and in the Forum Romanum.

It is the general opinion that the Villanovans were Umbrians, and that they must have represented one of the later waves of Italic invasion; for it was only in their time that the great Umbrian expansion into Central and Northern Italy took place, of which the ancient writers speak. According to De Sanctis, on the other hand, the Villanovans, by reason of their affinity with the Terramarans, must have been Etruscans; in which case they would have made their way into Etruria from the valley of the Po. According to the more commonly accepted theory, the Etruscans, coming from the Orient, would have landed on the Tuscan shores between the 10th and the 8th century, arriving in small warlike groups, and making their way inland and towards the north. They are supposed to have landed so far to the north, instead of in Southern Italy, because the coasts of Southern Italy were already occupied by the Greeks (but this would make the invasion as late as the close of the 8th century). The Greek colonization of Sicily began

with the foundation of Nasso by settlers from Chalcis, and of Syracuse by settlers from Corinth, about the middle of the 8th century. Catania was founded by the people of Nasso. Not long afterwards settlers from Syracuse are supposed to have founded Cumae, near the Naples of today, and soon after this the people of Cumae appear to have founded Zancle (Messina). In the second half of the 8th century began the colonization of the south-eastern coast of the peninsula: and in this period Metapontum, Sibari, Crotona and Locri Epizefiri were founded. According to tradition, Tarentum was built in 708, while some would date its establishment from the beginning of the Greek colonization. It was founded by colonists from Sparta. In Sicily the city of Selinus arose in the second half of the 7th century, and Agrigentum at the beginning of the 6th century; while in the Gulf of Naples Dikearchia (Pozzuoli) was founded in the second half of the 6th century, and then Neapolis (Naples) or "Cittanova" (so called because it was built in the neighbourhood of a "Palaeopolis" or Città Vecchia, which may have been Parthenope).

The Greeks were presently followed by the Phoenicians, whom we find established in Malta in the 7th century. In the 6th century the western coast of Sicily belonged to the Carthaginians, a Phoenician people established in Africa. Here they founded Panormos (Palermo) and Soluntum. The Phoenician colonization in Sardinia was of earlier date (8th century). On the southern coast they founded Calaris (Cagliari), and on the western coast Tharros. By the 6th century one can speak of Carthaginian or Punic colonists, instead of using the generic term of Phoenicians.

§ 3. ITALIAN ETHNOGRAPHY. GREEK AND ETRUSCAN CULTURES.—About 650 B.C. the map of Italy may be thus conceived: On the Ligurian coast and in the Western Alps are the Ligurians. In Venetia are the Veneti, an Illyrian people. Between the two are the Umbrians, extending from the Po to the Arno. Between the Arno and the Tiber are the Etruscans; to the south of the Tiber are first of all the Sabini, and then the Latini. Round the Abruzzese Apennines are a number of Sabellic populations, among which the Samnites are the most important. Between southern Latium and the tip of the peninsula

are other Osco-Sabellian populations: Volsci, Aurunci, Campani, Lucani, Bruttii. In Apulia dwell the Iapigi, another Illyrian population. The shores of Southern Italy are populated by the Greek colonists, and also a great part of Sicily, although the western portion is Carthaginian, while the interior is still inhabited by Siculi and Sicani.

The predominating civilization is Greek and Etruscan, and in the Greek and Etruscan cities we find the most highly developed forms of political life. The civilization of the Siceliots and Italiots (as the descendants of the Greeks established in Sicily and Southern Italy, or Magna Graecia, are called) is in every way analogous to that of Greece proper. The fundamental structure of this civilization is the "polis" or city; so that even when larger states are created they are still merely aggregations of cities.

Apparently there were never kings in the Italiot and Siceliot cities. There was an original aristocracy, which in most cases remained in power until the middle of the 6th century, when the ennobled plutocracy began to compete with it. The political situation of these classes varied from city to city (in Crotona the territorial aristocracy was predominant, in Sibari the commercial middle class); a factor which may have contributed to the quarrels between the cities themselves, which were a fundamental characteristic of the history of Magna Graecia. A well-known instance is the rivalry between Crotona and Sibari. A very general phenomenon, after the period of aristocratic hegemony, was the struggle between the aristocracy and the populace, the latter striving to secure equality before the law (whence the legislation attributed to legendary persons; Zaleucus in Locri, Caronda in Catania, Diocles in Syracuse), and the enjoyment of political rights. As in Greece, the opposition to the aristocracy favoured the rise of the "tyrants," who about the year 500 were to be found in almost all the cities of Sicily. (The Sicilian tyrant figures in the well-known legend of Phalaris of Agrigentum and his red-hot brazen bull.) In Southern Italy, on the other hand, tyranny had hardly arisen, and a factor which tended to avert its development was the politico-religious society of the Pythagorians, founded towards the close of the 6th century at Metapontum and Crotona, which venerated as its founder and master the Greek philosopher Pythagoras.

Magna Graecia was the home of a high civilization. We have already mentioned Pythagoras, who settled in Crotona in the year 530. Other Greek philosophers established themselves in the Italiot cities; for example, Xenophon and Parmenides in Elea. Later on philosophers were to spring from the soil of Grecian Italy itself. In the 5th century Empedocles of Agrigentum evolved the doctrine of the four elements; he was also a physician and a naturalist (medicine made considerable progress in Crotona). In the same century Zeno of Elea continued to teach the doctrines of the Eleatic school of philosophy, and Philolaos of Crotona those of the Pythagorean school. A religious movement which did not originate in Magna Graecia, but which took vigorous root there, was Orphism. Moreover, there was great literary activity among local writers. The Siceliot Stesichorus (*c.* 600), an epico-lyrical poet, celebrated the voyage of Aeneas from Troy to Italy. In the first half of the 5th century Epicharmus of Megara Hyblaea originated the Doric comedy, and in the second half Sophronius of Syracuse created the mime, reproducing the popular and bucolic life of Sicily. As a teacher of rhetoric we may mention Gorgias of Leontini, who taught also in Sicily, coupling the art with the so-called sophistic philosophy, of which a more famous teacher, Protagoras, was then living at Thurium.

There was a swift and splendid efflorescence of the arts, and especially of Sicilian religious architecture. About the end of the 7th and the beginning of the 6th century the first simple temples arose at Selinonte, Agrigentum and Syracuse; in the course of the 6th century was the great Doric temples which we find also in Magna Graecia, at Tarentum and Posidonia (or Paestum). The development of architectonics was accompanied by that of sculptured decoration; the metopes of Selinonte are famous. Architecture and sculpture continued to flourish throughout the 5th century, evolving—especially as regards the second—towards more refined forms representing the transition from archaism to classicism (the Demeter of Tarentum). At the close of the 5th century Crotona had a great painter in Zeuxis, and the decorative painting of ceramics flourished generally. Here industrial art found plenty of scope, and it also produced works of great aesthetic value in the shape of coins, above all in the Sicilian cities.

In Etruria also the walled city was the fundamental nucleus of the

life of the collectivity. We cannot say how far the cities were developments of the Terramaran agglomerations, and how far they were influenced by the example of the Grecian cities. We find in the Etruscan cities elective kings, or kings appointed for life; the members of the aristocratic class bore the name of *lucumon*. There was an originary organization into tribes and clans: in Mantua there were three *gentes*, each divided into four branches. The federative tendency was stronger than in Magna Graecia and in Sicily. In historical Etruria, down to its subjection by the Romans, we find a confederation of twelve cities: this number was ideal and programmatic, rather than always consonant with the actual reality. We must not exaggerate the solidarity of the bond, which was religious rather than political; each city retained not only its full internal autonomy, but also its independent external policy, with the right to make peace or war. However, the Etruscan cities were always sufficiently conscious of their original national unity. The Etruscan culture flourished from the 7th century onwards, and was largely derived from the Greek. The Etruscan language, of which we have examples in numerous inscriptions, remains an enigma. The principal testimony of Etruscan life, which was that of an aristocratic-plutocratic society, is found in the tombs, which contain statues, bas-reliefs, and an abundance of the products of the industrial arts, and also wall-paintings, the technique of which is derived from the art of Greece, although the scenes and the representations of life beyond the grave are taken from the life of aristocratic Etruscan society, or illustrate the religious beliefs of the Etruscans. The Etruscan religion was very different in its character from the Greek, with its wealth of monstrous and demonic figures and its great development of divination, especially in the form of hepatoscopy, which had affinities with the divination of the Near East.

§ 4. ETRUSCAN EXPANSION AND THE FIRST EXPANSION OF ROME. GREEKS, CARTHAGINIANS AND ITALICI.—In the 7th century Etruscan commerce underwent a great expansion, which presently assumed the form of colonization and colonial conquest. Towards the South the Etruscans occupied first Latium (Ardes, Lanuvium, Antium, Velletri, Circei), and then Campania, where they

founded the city of Capua, probably between 650 and 600. In the Western Mediterranean, in alliance with the Carthaginians, they obtained a foothold in Corsica. In the north they occupied Felsina, and the further regions of Bononia, whence they colonized the plain of the Po. This expansion towards the north took place about a century after their southward expansion. Besides Felsina, Mantua and Melpum (Mediolanum) were certainly cities of Etruscan origin. It is uncertain whether here too the confederation of twelve cities made its appearance, and the same doubt obtains in respect of Campania.

It is possible that the foundation of Rome may be attributed to the Etruscan conquest of Latium, which brought about the fusion of pre-existent villages. Some have sought to identify with Etruscan personages the two Tarquins who were kings of Rome, and who may be duplications of a single person, and also Servius Tullius; but this identification is contested. It is certain that Rome was originally a colony of Alban shepherds and herdsmen which had sprung up on the Palatine; it is probable that the Sabines founded on the Quirinal, facing the Palatine, another settlement, which was presently amalgamated with the former. Indeed, the Latin settlement on the Palatine may have amalgamated with the villages of Germalus, Palatium and Velia, which afterwards united with three villages on the Esquiline—Fagutal, Cispius and Oppius—and with the intermediate village on the Querquetulan hill, to form the federation of the *Septimontium*. The alleged constitution of the first kings, with senate and curia, and the three tribes, is an anachronism; and the alleged external conquests of this first period must be regarded as fantastic. The fall of Alba, for example, must be regarded as an achievement of the Latins, and not merely of the Romans. The constitution of the Septimontium would have been followed by its amalgamation with the Quirinal and the Sabine Viminal, and Campidoglio would then have constituted the acropolis and religious centre of the confederation thus expanded. There are those, however, who maintain that the Septimontium could not have existed unless Campidoglio had formed part of it. The Etruscan influence was very extensive at the beginning of Roman civilization: it is seen in religion, in family institutions, in armaments, in standards of measurement, in the rules of commerce, in the language, and in the alphabet.

## FROM PREHISTORIC TIMES TO THE ROMAN CONQUEST

Even the fasces of the lictors were of Etruscan origin. Hellenism also was a considerable influence in Latium and in Rome, even as early as the age of the kings.

The Etruscan conquests were consolidated in the second half of the 6th century, when the Etruscans concluded an alliance with the Carthaginians, and in the first naval battle recorded in Italian history defeated the Greeks of Phocaea (Marseilles) at Aleria in Corsica (c. 540?). On the other hand, the Etruscan expansion was not really durable in character, since it was effected without co-ordination by individual cities, or by adventurers recruited from several cities. About the year 525 the Etruscans were defeated before Cumae by Greeks under Aristodemus, who had come to the rescue of the city; about 506 the Cumani helped the Latins to defeat the Etruscans at Aricia, and this defeat marked the end of the Etruscan domination in Latium. A heavy blow to Etruscan imperialism, and for the Carthaginian ally, was the rise of Syracuse, at the beginning of the 5th century, under the tyrant Gelo. The latter seized the whole of the eastern coast of the island, and at Himera (c. 480) completely defeated the Carthaginian army. His brother Gero, who succeeded him in 478, continued the struggle against the Etruscans in the peninsula, and at Cumae (474) defeated their fleet, a disaster which marked the beginning of decadence for the Etruscan thalassocracy.

The Greeks, however, did not fully take advantage of the Etruscan decadence in order to consolidate and develop their dominion in Southern Italy. They were too divided among themselves for this, while they had to turn back and settle accounts with the Carthaginians, and also with the insurgent natives. We have evidence of this division among the Greek cities in the destruction of Sibari by Crotona about 510. In Syracuse, after the death of Gero, a democratic revolution had the effect of re-establishing the independence of the Sicilian cities which had been subjected to Syracuse, and this revolution spread to Southern Italy, where in Crotona and Metapontum, about 460, the aristocratic government of the Pythagoreans was overthrown. Syracuse, even after the democratic revolution, continued its activities in Italian waters, sending an expedition, about the year 452, against the island of Elba, the Tuscan coast, and Corsica. However, in Sicily it had to deal with



an attempt on the part of the Siculi to liberate themselves from the Greek dominion, and to set up a kingdom of their own under Ducetius; an attempt which eventually failed (460-440).

On the continent an Italian people, the Lucani, were more fortunate than the Siculi, for about the middle of the 5th century they succeeded in setting up a confederation which occupied a territory of some 30,000 square miles, so that it was the largest Italian state of the period. Still more serious in its effects upon Hellenism was the expansion, in the 5th century, of the warlike races of the Sabellic highlanders, who had hitherto remained in a stage of arrested political and social development: namely, that of the grouping of scattered villages in "pagi," a form of organization which survived in Sabina and Samnium until the Roman conquest, and in certain parts of the Apennines even into the reign of Augustus. The Sabelli, pouring out from their mountains in the direction of the plains of Latium and Campania, descended into the valley of the Liris; on the Adriatic side they drove the Umbrians from the coast and invaded Apulia, pressing upon the Japigi, who as they withdrew attacked and defeated the Greeks of Tarentum (473 or 471). In the second half of the 5th century the Samnites and Lucanians pressed hardly upon the Greeks. In 438 (or according to another chronology in 424) the Samnites took Capua, and in 421 Cumae, and established themselves as the dominant power in Campania.

The activity displayed by Athens, in the second half of the 5th century, when that city founded Thurii in 444, to take the place of Sibari, and sent colonists to Naples, was powerless to improve the prospects of Hellenism in Italy. The Athenian expansion ended by turning against the Doric city of Syracuse, so that it may be said to have constituted an episode of the Peloponnesian War: and the great Athenian expedition against Syracuse in 415-413 ended in disaster. Carthage took advantage of the enfeeblement of the Greek power in Sicily, capturing Selinus in 409 and Agrigentum in 405. Syracuse came to their rescue under Dionysius the Elder, who became tyrant of the city in 405. He fought several wars against the Carthaginians, but he did not pursue them to a conclusion, being distracted by the submission of the Sicilian cities and by the attempted expansion into Italy. There a league of Greek cities had been formed against the Lucani, but it was

unable to arrest their progress; in 400 Poseidonia fell into their hands. Dionysius, rather than support the Greeks, concluded an alliance with the Lucani and defeated the Greeks on the Helleborus (the Stilaro?). He aimed at acquiring hegemony in the Upper Adriatic by the foundation of Ancona, and the establishment of colonies in Hadria and Issa (Lissa): he concluded an alliance with the Galli (of whom we shall speak directly) and entered into relations with the Veneti. At the same time he encouraged the aspirations of Syracuse toward dominion over the Tyrrhenian Sea, despatching expeditions to the Tuscan coast and to Corsica. This megalomaniac policy dispersed the energies of Syracuse and prevented it from expelling the Carthaginians from Sicily. Yet another war with the Carthaginians ended by leaving Western Sicily as far as the Platani (Halycus) in their hands (382). There followed a renewed attack upon Magna Graecia on the part of Dionysius, with the capture of Crotona (379); and again an indecisive war with Carthage. After the death of Dionysius the Elder (367) his son Dionysius the Younger was unable to maintain himself in power, and Syracuse passed through a long period of convulsions, ending in 343 with the re-establishment of the free constitution by Timoleon, who defeated the Carthaginians on the Crimissus. This facilitated the liberation of the Siceliot cities from the tyrants and their alliance. In the meantime, in Southern Italy, the Italic populations continued to develop: about 350 the Bruttii formed a league with a federal capital at Consentia (Cosenza), and the Greek territory was steadily diminishing in area. The repeated appeals for leaders from the northern country which were made by Tarentum in the second half of the 4th century were unavailing (Archidamos of Sparta, Alexander Molossus, King of Epirus, and Cleonymus of Sparta).

§ 5. THE INTERNAL POLITICAL LIFE OF ROME BEFORE THE PUNIC WARS.—The fall of the monarchy in Rome coincides very nearly with the end of the Etruscan dominion. But even in the first years of the republic the legend of Porsenna affords evidence of the assured preponderance of the Etruscans in Rome. To this preponderance, probably, was due the fact that the Romans took no part in the Latin revolt against the Etruscans which broke out in Aricia.

The fall of the monarchy was connected, in Rome, as everywhere in Greece and Italy, with the triumph of the aristocracy. We find that the Rome of the First Republic was divided into the *patricii*—assembled in groups of families known as *gentes*—who claimed a common origin, and who were in enjoyment of full political rights, and the *plebes*, who were citizens in enjoyment of personal freedom, but who had no share in the administration of the state. A special class, which was not, however, distinguished by a definite political function or aspect, was that of the *clientes*, persons depending upon one or another of the patrician families, in a personal relation of protection on the one part, and service on the other. Patricians and plebeians were united in *curiae* (whence the *comitia curiata*), and the *curiae* were assembled in *tribus*. These *tribus* were originally three in number, each containing ten *curiae*, and they were obliged to furnish, in the event of war, a contingent of infantry and cavalry. The reunion of all the citizens for the purpose of deliberating on public affairs constituted the popular assembly; a more restricted assembly, composed originally of patricians only, was the senate, which was entrusted with the direction of affairs. The popular assembly elected the heads of the executive power from among the patricians. These heads of the state were elected annually; they were originally known as praetors, and were three in number. There was afterwards a differentiation of functions, by virtue of which one of the praetors, retaining this name, assumed the function of judicial administration, while the other two, known as consuls, led the armies in the field, and presided over the proceedings in the Senate and the popular assembly. An exceptional office, in serious conjunctures, was that of dictator.

The internal history of Rome during the 5th and 4th centuries, down to the early decades of the 3rd century, was essentially that of the struggle of the plebeians against the patricians, a struggle to obtain better economic conditions for themselves (aggravated by the indebtedness of the small proprietors to the wealthy patricians), and also parity of political and civil rights. The plebeians were led in this conflict by the tribunes of the commons, *tribuni plebis*, who must in the first place have been the heads of the tribes into which the people was divided in the Roman Campagna, in accordance with an organization which took

the place of the old division into *pagi*. From local rural chieftains the tribunes appear to have transformed themselves into citizen magistrates, officials who represented and protected the *plebs*. As such, they seem in the beginning to have been four in number, but later on they were increased to ten: the basis of their power was the right of "intercession," by which they could suspend the execution of the magistrates' decrees the measures voted by the *comitiae*, and the deliberations of the senate. Their person was inviolable.

Under the leadership of the tribunes, the plebs fought a first battle for civil equality, obtaining the codification of the common law, which had hitherto been administered in an arbitrary manner by the patricians. This codification was accomplished by an extraordinary magistracy (*decemviri*), elected for two years (451-450), the result of whose labours was the "Twelve Tables." Not long afterwards (445) the plebs obtained the right of matrimony with persons of patrician rank, and the admission (444) to the new magistracy of "military tribunes with consular powers," who were elected from time to time to the office of consul.

Military reforms followed the Gallic outbreak (of which we shall speak presently), leading to a new organization of the citizens, based on the register or *census*. The citizens were divided into five classes, in order of their wealth in land, and each class was divided into a certain number of *centuriae*; a sixth class (the *proletarius*) comprised those who held no land and were not under the obligation of military service. Above all the classes were the *centuriae* which provided the army with its cavalry (knights, *equites*) while all the rest furnished the infantry. Special officers, the censors, compiled the register of citizens and entered the latter in their various classes. The centuriate order served on the popular *comitiae* and brought about a radical transformation of the state, inasmuch as the criterion of the family (patriciate) was replaced by that of the census, which included the smallest landowners. However, the superiority still remained with the wealthier classes, since they possessed a greater number of *centuriae*, each of which gave a unitary vote.

The *plebs* achieved political equality when it was admitted to all offices, including the consulate (366), and laid the foundations of its preponderance with the Hortensian Law (287), by virtue of which the

deliberations of the *plebs* united in *comitiae tributae* were of equal value with those of the *comitiae centuriatae*. But even now the Roman republic preserved its aristocratic character, for the senate and the consuls continued to direct public affairs, and the consuls—if only because they were unpaid—were actually drawn from the upper classes. In this way a new caste was formed, the nobility, a mixture of patricians and plebeian parvenus.

§ 6. THE ROMAN HEGEMONY OVER LATIUM.—These internal conflicts, so far from weakening the Roman state, seem to have stimulated its external activity, for it was while they were taking place that Rome extended her dominion. Its first foundation was the preponderant position which she achieved in Latium as regards the other Latin cities, to which her geographical situation contributed, together with the commercial prosperity which resulted from this situation. From the beginning of the 5th century to the second half of the 4th century Rome was a member of the Latin League (which had its sacred centre on the Mons Albanus, the modern Monte Caro); at first, in all probability, on terms of complete equality with the other cities. For Rome, the 5th century was a time of frontier skirmishes; in the north-east the Romans fought the Sabini, in the south the Aequi and the Volsci; against the latter Romans, Latini and Hernici fought in alliance, and being victorious they incorporated part of the enemy territory, while other enemy cities were compelled to enter the Latin League. Suddenly, to the north of the Tiber, Rome came into conflict with the Etruscans, her principal antagonist being Veii, which was only a few miles distant. The conquest of this city at the beginning of the 4th century was of great significance as regards the expansion of the Roman state, which after this victory comprised more than 840 square miles.

The abandonment of Veii by the other Etruscan cities was due in some degree to the internal crises from which these cities were suffering, in which the monarchies were overthrown by the aristocracies, while the latter had to fight the popular classes. But the more important and immediate cause of this abandonment must have been the Gallic invasion. The Galli or Gauls, an Indo-European population, having occupied the region which thereafter took its name from them, between

the second half of the 5th and the beginning of the 4th century descended into Italy through the Western Alps and settled in the valley of the Po, subjecting the Etruscan cities. The Insubres established themselves at Mediolanum, the Cenomani at Brescia, and the Boii at Felsina, which took the name of Bononia. The Senones from the valley of the Po advanced through Central Italy, almost to Ancona on the east of the Apennines; on the west they crossed Etruria, and having defeated the Romans on the Allia, they captured and burned Rome (387). The Romans were saved from final ruin, either by the payment of ransom, or because for other reasons the Senones retraced their steps. After the Gallic invasion the so-called Servian Walls were raised to defend the city, and military reforms were introduced in respect of armaments and tactics, the Etruscan phalanx being replaced by the formation of maniples, standing in three lines of battle which advanced in successive waves.

One repercussion of the Roman disaster was the hostility of various Latin cities; but about this time Tusculum was incorporated in the Roman state. About 368, moreover, Rome began to reconstitute the Latin League, under her own hegemony, by the inclusion of several of the Volscian cities. The establishment of Roman tribes on the territory confiscated in the south of Latium, and an alliance with the Samnites and with Capua, gave Rome an absolute preponderance over Latium. Yet another attempt at rebellion on the part of Falerii, Tarquinia and Cervetri was suppressed, and Cervetri was incorporated as a *municipium*. Several Gallic invasions were repelled.

Having achieved hegemony over Latium, Rome was now confronted by the Samnite Confederation, consisting of the Pentri, Caudini and Hirpini, whose dominions extended to the Adriatic coast between Ortona and Monte Gargano, and to the Tyrrhenian coast between Amalfi and the Silarus (7,000 to 7,500 square miles, so that it was the second state in Italy as regards area, coming immediately after the Etruscan League; but it was sparsely populated). Among the Samnite tribes a system of agricultural, pastoral and military democracy prevailed; all the landowners were equal among themselves, while proletarians and slaves were few. But the federal bond, whose custodian was the *meddix tuticus*, was weak. In the course of its expansion

the Samnite Confederation descended the valley of the Liris and entered Campania, where it encountered populations of the same stock which had established themselves there previously and had become largely Hellenized (§ 4). Predominant among these populations was Capua, with the Campanian League. The Campanians appealed to the Romano-Latin League; and there followed the first Samnite War, as a result of which the Samnites abandoned the project of occupying Capua, and Capua became a member of the Romano-Latin League. Now, however, the Latins once more came into conflict with the Romans, and more sharply than ever, rebelling against their supremacy, and having taken up arms against them, they found allies in the Campanians. Rome was victorious at Trifanum, between Sinuessa and Minturnae (340), and dissolved the political Latin League, preserving it merely as a religious league, entering into relations with each Latin city separately. Some of these cities became allied to Rome (Tivoli, Preneste), and others became incorporated in the Roman state, while preserving their internal autonomy. The Campanians were obliged to cede a portion of their territory, and were reduced to the status of citizens without political rights, apart from a section of the Capuan aristocracy, to which they were conceded. Now the Roman territory measured 2,300 square miles, and the allied territory 1,900 square miles, with a population of half a million and two or three hundred thousand respectively. It was the most populous state in Italy.

§ 7. THE CONQUEST OF PENINSULAR ITALY.—The Romans reinforced their position in Campania by a war to compel Greek Naples, the emporium of Greek commerce in Central Italy, to enter into alliance with them on terms which were favourable to the city (326). The submission of Naples provoked the second Samnite War, in which the Romans established communication with their allies in Apulia (the Arpani), to the detriment of the Samnites. Notwithstanding the serious defeat at the Caudine Forks (321), they consolidated their position in Apulia, and occupied Lucera; nor did the Samnite offensive in Latium, which was victorious at Lataule, between Terracina and Fondi (315), succeed in shaking the unity of the Roman state. The Romans won back what they had lost; they returned to the Liris as victors, and

isolated Samnium by a chain of fortified positions which extended to the Adriatic watershed.

Now, however, other Italian peoples came to the aid of the Samnites, and this was the beginning of what have been called the wars of Italian independence. Between 312 and 304 Samnites, Hernici, Etruscans, and Umbrians took up arms against the Romans; in 306 the Romans were able to dissolve the Hernic League: Alatri, Ferentum, and Veroli were compelled to enter into alliance with Rome; Anagni was incorporated and became entirely dependent. In 304 the Samnites sued for peace. Now the territory of Rome and her allies comprised more than 10,000 square miles, of which 3,100 formed the Roman state. The ratio between the two figures shows how greatly the hegemony of Rome had increased. In 300 the Samnites again went to war, forming a larger coalition of Umbrians, Gauls, Sabines and Lucanians. But this was deficient in territorial and political cohesion, and defections were not lacking, while the cities, the colonies, and most of the allies remained faithful to Rome. Further, the Romans concluded alliances with the Marsi, the Marrucini, the Paeligni, the Frentani, the Vestini, and the Piceni, by whom Samnium was completely encircled on the north, as it was already in the west and the east. At Sentinum (Sassoferrato) in 295 the Romans won a great victory over the forces of the coalition.

In 290 the Samnites concluded peace, accepting the alliance with Rome and retaining their territory, although this was henceforth embedded in that of the Romans and their allies. In the same year the Sabines were subjected, and the greater part of their territory was annexed. In 284 the Etruscans and the Senones were victorious at Arezzo, but the following year they suffered a crushing defeat at the Vadimonian Lake (Lago di Bassano). The Etruscans and the Boii made peace; the Lucani were compelled to submit; the territory of the Senones was annexed from the Aesis (Esino) to the Rubicon, and the colony of Sena Gallica (Senigallia) was founded.

Thus a state was created in Central Italy which was territorially strong and whose hegemony was firmly established. Its creation was the work of two centuries. The subjection of Southern Italy, on the other hand, was very quickly effected, for the Greek cities were much less warlike than the Italic populations of Central Italy, and also more



divided. The attention of Rome was drawn to Magna Graecia by the increasing interest in maritime commerce. As early as 311 Rome had appointed special officers to supervise the building and equipment of her ships; maritime stations and colonies had been founded in Southern Latium, and on the island of Pontia (Ponza). Hence the commercial treaties with Carthage and the delimitation of spheres of influence (348 and 306). Good relations with Carthage might serve as a safeguard in the event of hostilities with Greek Italy. In Sicily Syracuse had resumed its hegemonical policy, thanks to the tyrant Agathocles (in power from 317 or 316), who attacked the other Greek cities of the island, and also Carthage, their ally, achieving the subjection of the former. In 305 he assumed the title of king. He then supported the Italiots, at war with the Lucani and the Bruttii. On the death of Agathocles (289) Syracuse recovered its liberty and lost its dominion over the Siceliots. The Greek cities of the peninsula now found themselves in a critical position, owing to the assaults of the Bruttii and the Lucani. Thurium successfully appealed to Rome for aid against the Lucani (282). Roman garrisons, at the request of the citizens, were established at Reggio and Locri.

The advance of the Romans to the Strait of Messina led to a conflict with Tarentum, the largest among the Greek cities of the mainland, which laid claim to hegemony over the rest. War having broken out in 280, Tarentum, in accordance with its established tradition (§ 4), appealed to the Greek potentate, Pyrrhus, King of Epirus. He came, and in 280 defeated the Romans near Heraclea, in the plain of the Siris. Reinforced by the Samnites and Lucani, he advanced in the direction of Rome; but Rome, having secured her rear by concluding a peace with the Etruscans, did not give ground, and Pyrrhus turned back. Once more advancing against him, the Romans were again defeated at Ascoli in Apulia (279), but not without inflicting serious losses on the enemy. Invited by Syracuse and Agrigentum to defend them against the Carthaginians, Pyrrhus broke off the difficult campaign in Italy and crossed into Sicily, where he was victorious. But differences arose between him and his allies, whereupon he returned to Italy. Now, at Beneventum, he was defeated by the Romans, after which he left the peninsula (275). The Lucani and Samnites were obliged

to return to the Roman alliance, losing part of their territory; the Greek cities, however, were able to become allies on more favourable conditions. Posidonia became a Roman colony, changing its name to Paestum. Between 270 and 264 expeditions were sent against the Campani of Reggio, the Piceni, the Iapigi, and the Etruscan Volsinii. The Roman state, with allied territory, now extended from Pisa and Rimini to the Strait of Messina; 9,600 square miles belonging to Rome, 57,600 to her allies. Altogether, it has been calculated that it had three million inhabitants, of whom rather less than one tenth were male adult Roman citizens, available for service with the army.

§ 8. ORGANIZATION OF ROMAN ITALY.—Thus the whole Italian peninsula was either subject to Rome or united to Rome by political association. The very name of Italy, at first given to the extreme point of the peninsula, and then gradually extended to the whole of Southern Italy, was now applied to the whole of Roman or Peninsular Italy.

In considering the organization which Rome impressed upon Peninsular Italy it is necessary to distinguish, as we have done repeatedly, between the Roman state and the states allied with Rome. The Roman state consisted of: (a) the ancient territory of Rome and the territories afterwards incorporated in it, the whole being divided into thirty-five tribes, four urban and thirty-one rural; (b) the *municipia*; (c) the *conciliabula* and *fora*; (d) the colonies. The territory of (a) was that of the city of Rome and, let us say, its countryside, whatever its extent—and an endeavour was made to preserve geographical compactness as far as possible. A good part of the territory annexed was *ager publicus*, belonging to the Roman exchequer. In the course of time there was added to this form of pure and simple incorporation with Roman territory a form of association, in the case of urban communities, by which the individuality of the city was preserved, while its inhabitants became Roman citizens, but without political rights (*civis sine suffragio*). These communities were the *municipia*, so called because their inhabitants were required to perform the duties (*munia*) of citizens, without possessing all the rights. (It

seems, however, that some of the older *municipia*, in Latium, may have enjoyed full citizenship from the first.) The *municipia* retained their magistrates, elected by the citizens, who performed the less important administrative functions (as aediles and police officers); jurisdiction, however, was exercised by the Roman praetor, directly or through the medium of his representatives, the prefects. (Some authorities, however, maintain that there were *municipia*—though in any case they were very few in number—with autonomous jurisdiction.) The inhabitants of the *municipia* enjoyed the right of *connubium* with the Romans, and the right to trade with them. With various safeguards, differing in each case, the concession of political rights was rapidly extended to the various *municipia*.

Other territories were annexed to the Roman state, retaining an individual administration of their own, but without constituting a civic community. They were aggregations of rural populations with a centre (*conciliabulum*) where people assembled for commercial and administrative purposes. The *conciliabula* also played their part in the administration of justice in some of the prefectures. Analogous to the *conciliabula* were the *fora*, except that these were centres created *ex novo* and expressly by the Roman consuls, for the most part on the military roads which they had constructed.

The colonies were communities of Roman citizens who by a special law had been settled on a portion of annexed territory, which was divided among their members. The colonists retained all the rights of Roman citizens, for the exercise of which they were inscribed as members of one of the rural tribes; while for purposes of jurisdiction they were included in the prefectures. The government of the colonies was exercised by magistratures analogous to, but simpler than, those of the mother country (praetors).

While the sole governmental authority of Rome was exercised over all the territories hitherto mentioned, the territories of the states which were federated with Rome retained their civic individuality, and it was precisely on this understanding that they contracted the *foedus* with Rome. However, only a certain minority of these alliances were concluded on terms of parity (*foedus aequum*). In such cases there was a mutual pledge of non-aggression, with a promise to refuse

passage to aggressors, and to support each other with all their forces in the case of a defensive war. The *foedera non aequa* could call themselves protectorates rather than allies of Rome. These federated states were obliged unconditionally to fight by the side of Rome, while renouncing the right to make war on their own account. They had to furnish Rome with a military (or in some cases a naval) contingent. The ostensible object of these alliances was "to conserve the majesty of the Roman people." The federal contingent was to be recruited, equipped and paid by the allied state, and it fought under its own commanders. In some exceptional cases Rome had the right to establish garrisons in the allied states; and this was accompanied by the right to take hostages. The diplomatic representation of the confederacy was, of course, reserved to Rome. The federated states could not make war upon one another, and in case of disputes Rome intervened as arbitrator. The internal autonomy of the states was in theory complete; in actual fact, even here there were frequent instances of Roman intervention, sometimes invoked by and sometimes imposed upon the state. In every federated state there was, of course, a Romanophile party (usually aristocratic) which called for modifications of the constitution in its own favour. In the course of time the political institutions of Rome were largely imitated by the federated states, or at least, by the Italic states.

Rome regulated the external trade between the several states of the League. The right of the states to coin money was apparently frustrated when Rome prohibited the use of their currency in her own commercial relations with them. In some cases the rights of *commercium* and *connubium* as between the federated states and Rome were prohibited. On the other hand, the citizens of the allied states had the right of entry into the Roman colonies, and could acquire land in them; and in most cases the right of *commercium* was accompanied by that of *connubium* with Roman citizens. Under certain conditions, moreover, it was possible for individuals to acquire Roman citizenship. On the Latins were conferred the general right to acquire it under certain conditions without the necessity of obtaining a special legislative concession in each individual case. Thus, as time went on close economic and personal bonds were formed between

Rome and the federated states, while nuclei of Roman citizens began to spring up in the different states.

The "Latin colonies" must be regarded as a special category of federated state, or as something intermediate between the federated states and the communities annexed to Rome. In the beginning, colonies were founded by the Latin League, so that some of the colonies may have been Roman, while some were founded by other cities of the League. After the dissolution of the Latin League Rome continued to found colonies on her own account; they then consisted of non-Roman Latins, and like the Roman colonies, were scattered all over Italy. They were bound to Rome by a perpetual treaty; they enjoyed the rights of *commercium* and *connubium* with Roman citizens, and also complete municipal autonomy. Their constitution, at first, appears to have been a complete reproduction of the Roman constitution (consuls, praetors, censors).

The organization imposed by Rome upon the Italian peninsula should not be described—as it often has been—as an Italic confederation. A confederation signifies a number of sovereign states united by a reciprocal federal bond. Here, on the other hand, we find a number of bilateral treaties between the various states and Rome; the only existing bond was a bond between all these states and Rome, not a bond between the different states. The conclusion of these alliances with Rome resulted in the political annulment of the ancient leagues between the cities (as the Etruscan League was annulled after the formation of the Latin League), although they continued to exist as religious confederations.

The result for which Rome was striving in creating this federal organization was the constitution of an auxiliary army which would be at her disposal for purposes of defence and offence, under her tutelage, and the instrument of her foreign policy. We know that by the end of the 3rd century Rome had at her disposal rather more than 300,000 soldiers of her own and rather more than 400,000 allied troops. The military efficiency of the League was greatly enhanced by the roads which Rome proceeded to construct from one end of the federal territory to the other, at first mainly on annexed territory, but then also on that of the allies. The first and most famous of these

great roads was the Appian Way (from Rome to Capua, and then to Brundisium), which was built at the close of the 4th century.

The Roman-Italian "symmachy" had consequences which went far beyond the immediate and explicit objects which Rome had proposed to herself: it resulted in the national unification of Italy. The Roman federation or protectorate gave the peninsula security against external enemies (greatly increased when Roman rule was extended to the Alps), and internal peace; it safeguarded and multiplied communications, trade and industry were stimulated, while there was an extensive commingling and a cultural assimilation of the various Italian peoples. One of its results, therefore, was a uniform civilization throughout the Italian peninsula; predominantly Roman, with considerable persistence of Italic elements, as regards political and social life; predominantly Greek, with the absorption of indigeneous elements, as regards the arts and letters. After the conquest of Campania the Greek influence began to make itself strongly felt in Rome, not only in the field of culture properly so called, but also in respect of manners.

## CHAPTER II

### ROMAN ITALY TO THE FALL OF THE EMPIRE

§ 9. ROMAN ITALY IN THE EPOCH OF THE PUNIC WARS. THE CONQUEST OF NORTHERN ITALY.—The period of Italian unification under the hegemony of Rome was followed by a period of expansion and of conquest in the basin of the Mediterranean. This continued throughout the First (264–241) and the Second (218–201) Punic War, the Second Macedonian War (200–197), the Asiatic War (191–189), the Third Macedonian War (171–168), with the partition and then (146) the annexation of Macedonia, the Achaian War, with the destruction of Corinth (146) and the reduction of Greece to a province, the Third Punic War (149–146), with the destruction of Carthage, and the Spanish War for the subjection of the Iberian peninsula, of which the culminating episode was the destruction of Numantia (133).

The initiative and the politico-military direction of all these wars were purely Roman; the other Italian states and peoples took part in them with their federal levies. Hence the politico-territorial results of all these imperialistic activities—that is, the constitution of the provinces of Sicily, Sardinia, Macedonia, Achaia (Greece), Africa, etc.—was of immediate concern only to Rome; the provinces were possessions or *desmesnes* (*praedia*) of the Roman people. Nevertheless, this series of wars, and the Mediterranean expansion of Rome, had great political, social, and economic consequences for the whole of Italy. Moreover, during this same period a series of changes occurred on the soil of the peninsula which had the effect of continuing the work of unification.

The first Punic War marked the growth of Rome into a great naval power, to which the co-operation of the confederates of Rome was of special importance, since the majority of the officers were furnished by these confederates, and at first the whole of the ships' companies.

During the same war the ranks of the Roman citizens were greatly increased by the concession of full citizenship to the Piceni and Sabini, and the formation of two additional tribes. The occupation of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica absorbed these islands into the Italian military system (but not into the politico-administrative system). Sicily and Sardinia constituted an important reinforcement for the strategico-naval situation of the Roman symmarchy, and a contribution of the first order to the corn supplies of the peninsula. The reduction of Sicily and Sardinia to the status of province meant that part of their territory became *ager publicus*, and the rest was subjected to tribute (theoretically a tenth of the revenues, but in fact an arbitrary tax). This did not prevent the survival or creation of federal cities (Syracuse) and Roman *municipia*.

The first Punic War had as one of its results a further expansion into Cisalpine Gaul. The fact that the small Roman properties suffered damage from the war (owing to the absence of the husbandmen) led to the distribution of the *ager Picens* and the land of the Gallic Senones; the Boii and the Insubres, thinking themselves threatened, invaded Etruria, and there was a new Gallic war, eventually won by the Romans, who overthrew their enemies at Clastidium (Casteggio) (222), conquered Milan, built the Via Flaminia from Rome to Rimini (afterwards continued by the Via Emilia to Piacenza), and founded the colonies of Piacenza and Cremona. Hannibal's invasion, with the resounding series of victories during the first two years of the war, subjected the consistency of the Romano-Italic federation to a hard test. Not only did the Gauls and Ligurians, who were not included in the federation, hasten to reinforce Hannibal's army, but after Cannae some of the confederates deserted, especially in Southern Italy: nearly all the Samnites, the Capuans, the Lucani, and the Bruttii, and later on Tarentum and other Greek cities. The defection of Capua, then the second city in Italy, was especially serious. However, the Romans retained a series of fortresses in the rebel territory, while the nucleus of the confederate states in Central Italy remained loyal to Rome. As a general thing, in the various Italic cities the senate was on the side of Rome, and the people on that of Carthage. In Sicily Syracuse went over to the side of Carthage; it was retaken



after a long siege (213-212), and the same thing happened in the case of Capua (211). The punitive measures of the Romans were extremely severe, in more than one case dealing the re-subjected city a mortal blow. Capua (where all the Roman citizens present at the time of the rebellion were slain) was deprived of all autonomy, and indeed of the very status of city; the notables were beheaded, great numbers of the citizens were sold, and many estates were confiscated. Syracuse was made a tributary; the townsfolk of Agrigentum were sold as slaves and replaced by Romanophile Sicilians; thirty thousand inhabitants of Tarentum were sold into slavery. It was perhaps a result of such repressive measures that the revolt became intensified and continued to spread; in 209 twelve Latin colonies refused to supply contingents or to pay taxes; there were conspiracies among the Etruscans, and from Umbria volunteers went to join Hasdrubal. In 204 the twelve colonies were reduced to the status of *municipia sine suffragio*. On the victorious termination of the war extensive confiscations of territory were effected in Southern Italy. These confiscations, and others effected in Sicily, favoured the development of the *latifundium* to the advantage of the Italic capitalists. In Sicily this development of the *latifundium* was accompanied by a decrease in the population, a degradation of the economic conditions of the island, and an increase in the number of slaves, which afterwards gave rise to the Servile Wars.

After the second Punic War Northern Italy was almost entirely subjected to Rome. The principal resistance came from the Liguri, who, being pressed by the Gauls, had moved southwards, threatening the Tuscan cities and advancing as far as Arezzo. The Ligurian campaign was a difficult one, as it was complicated by a war against the Boii and the Insubres. The latter were the first to be subdued: and in 189 the Latin colony of Bononia was established on the territory of the Boii. In order to subject the Liguri the Romans resorted to the transplantation of whole tribes, as the Assyrians had done in the Near East. Thus the Apuani were transported to Beneventum. In the end the coast was subjected as far as the Massalian (Marseilles) frontier. Some time in the 3rd century (we do not know when) Italic merchants founded the trading station of Genoa. On the north-eastern frontier the Romans

subjected the Carnic Gauls, who, having crossed the Carnic Alps, established themselves near the mouths of the Isonzo (c. 183): on which occasion the Senate sent an embassy to the Transalpine Gauls to warn them that all the territory to the south of the Alps was *ager populi Romani*. Western Istria was occupied, and the colony of Aquileia was established there (181). The subjection of Istria was completed in 177.

§ 10. INTERNAL TRANSFORMATIONS OF ROMANO-ITALIC SOCIETY. CULTURE.—The series of wars of conquest fought between the beginning of the 3rd and the middle of the 2nd century brought about a radical transformation of Romano-Italic society. Until this period it had been composed essentially of small landowners, each looking after his own agricultural holding, sedentary in habit and living a life of tradition. Now, since the cultivated land was deserted in consequence of successive campaigns, and since cheap agricultural produce was pouring into the country from abroad, the small landowners were ruined, and their holdings were passing into the hands of the capitalists, who were accumulating fortunes as a result of the industrial and commercial activities fostered by the wars and conquests. Munitions of war, transportation, public works, the capture of movable wealth as war booty, the confiscation of territory, the exploitation of mines and the collection of tribute (by the *publicani*) resulted in a very rapid increase of mobile capital and of speculation. After the third Macedonian war Italian mercantile fleets sailed to the Orient in competition with the Greek and Asiatic ships. In Italic agriculture the change from the small to the large holding was accompanied by a change from the culture of cereals to that of vines, olives, and fruit, and to horticulture and sheep-farming.

In this period an artistic Latin literature had its origin. The Rome of the first five centuries had songs of various kinds, religious and profane, in Saturnian verse. (It is uncertain whether this metre was quantitative or accented.) There were also the liturgical chants of the priestly colleges (see later) of the Salii and the Arval Brothers; while the so-called Fescennine verses contained jests and coarse and licentious invectives, with which *saturae* were interwoven. In prose there were

ritual and legal formulae (as, for example, the Twelve Tables), calendars, and lists of consuls, with records of the more notable events. There were similar productions also among the Italic peoples; among the sacral laws of the 3rd and 2nd centuries are the famous Eugubine Tables. But in all this there was nothing that can be called artistic literature. This literature was formed under the influence of the Greek culture, which had become stronger since the conquest of Southern Italy. It was from this region that the first Greek writers came to Rome, which had become the centre of the peninsula. A Greek of Tarentum, Livius Andronicus, in the period of the first Punic War, translated the *Odyssey* into Saturnian verse, and gave the first productions of Greek tragedy and comedy, in Latin versions. A Campanian, Nevius, during the period of the Second Punic War, not only translated Greek tragedies, but wrote others on Roman subjects; he wrote comedies with elements of political satire, and above all, he was the author of the first national epic, the subject being the First Punic War. A more robust and original writer, who continued on these lines, was Ennius (239-269), a native of Apulia, who was among the friends of Scipio Africanus. He composed in hexameters sixteen books of *Annales*, extending from the origins of Rome to his own times; and he elaborated and polished the popular *saturae*. The first Latin author of whom entire works have come down to us is the comic dramatist Plautus, an Umbrian, rather older than Ennius, the author of a whole series of comedies, based on Greek plots, but full of Italic salt. With Terence, who was of African origin, and a friend of Scipio Emilianus, the Roman comedy attained literary perfection; with Lucilius, another friend of Scipio (180-183), a native of Lower Latium, the Roman satire achieved its greatest potency before the advent of Horace. Prose writers cultivated more especially the historical *genre*; at first writing in Greek, with Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus, who wrote histories of the Second Punic War, and then in Latin, with Marcus Porcius Cato, who in his *Origines* gave a broad, comprehensive account of the history of the Italian cities. He was also the first Latin orator.

As opposed to the circle of the Scipios, which was open to the influences of Greek culture, Cato was the leader of the reaction

against the Hellenism which was rapidly penetrating Romano-Italic society; a reaction which utterly failed. Not only the literature, but also the philosophy and religion of Greece were extending their influence in Rome. The original religion of Rome was very different in its outward semblance from the anthropomorphic, individualistic, aesthetic religion of Greece. The Roman divinities were at once abstract and utilitarian, inasmuch as every particular condition of life, every action and motive, every class of object had its special deity: *Educa* and *Potina* taught children to eat and drink, *Forculus* guarded the door of the house, *Bubona* protected the cattle, *Epona* the horses, *Silvanus* the shepherds, *Mercurius* the merchants. The *Lares* and *Penates* were the tutelary genii of the family and the home. Everyone had his protecting genius; so had the family, the city, the Roman people. There were countless personifications of moral qualities: Peace, Faith, Liberty, Victory, Fortune. The naturalistic divinities represented not so much Nature in herself as Nature in her relations to man; and they were, above all, agrarian deities. (Saturn, Liber, Ceres, Venus.)

This Greek influence brought about a twofold transformation in the Roman religion; Greek divinities were introduced, such as Apollo and Artemis (Diana), and the great Grecian deities were identified with national deities, so that the latter acquired the anthropomorphic and aesthetico-literary character of the former. The cults were closely connected with the state: the whole of public life was penetrated by religion and marked by an accompaniment of religious gestures; and the state even supervised the religious observances of the family. The purpose of the religious ceremonies was to ensure that the gods fulfilled all their functions as protectors and promoters of the Roman state; and the official cult had absolute pre-eminence in the religion of Rome. It had many priests: the pontifices, with the *Pontifex Maximus* at their head, who superintended every detail of worship: the augurs, who read the auspices, the Salii, priests of Mars and Quirinus, the Luperci, priests of Faunus, and the Arval Brothers, who performed such rites as conferred fertility upon the fields (*arva*).

§ II. THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CRISIS. AGRARIAN LAWS AND ITALIC UNREST.—The economic and social crisis of the Romano-Italic state provoked such acute manifestations as the insurrection of the slaves, or “servile wars,” in which proletarianized elements took part as well as the slaves properly so called. There was a rather serious war of this type in Sicily about 138, and this was complicated by a re-awakening of the sentiment of independence.

In Rome the unrest of the proletarianized middle class revived the programme of the agrarian laws, which had already been debated during the first centuries of the struggle between the patricians and the plebeians. What this programme proposed was to give land to those who possessed none, drawing it from the public demesne, and revoking, with this end in view, the concessions or usurpations of land by which the great landowners had profited. Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus, a member of one of the noblest families of Rome, being elected tribune of the commons in the year 133, proposed a law according to which no citizen would be allowed to possess more than five hundred *jugeri* of public land, plus a hundred and fifty for each adult son, with a maximum of a thousand. Such territory as remained available after the application of the law was to be distributed among the poor citizens, as their inalienable property, in consideration of the payment of an annual due. Notwithstanding the violent opposition of the great landowners, the law was approved, and a special commission actually began to apply it. The conservative nobles resorted to “direct action”; Tiberius Gracchus was assassinated by a band of armed men. The law remained, but its application was arrested. The agrarian law was once more demanded by Caius Gracchus, the brother of Tiberius, in association with it a more comprehensive programme of Italic democracy.

In the territories of the federated Italic populations—which comprised by far the greater portion of the Italian territory subject to Rome—the economic crisis aggravated the discontent provoked by their exclusion from the government of the Roman state. Their political organization was now closely similar to that of Rome: we find at the head of the various Italic states two praetors (corresponding to the consuls), quaestors, censors, aediles, and sometimes even

tribunes of the people. But these constitutional mechanisms operated in a vacuum, since all matters relating to the vital interests of Italic populations were decided by the sovereign Roman state, and they did not necessarily form part of this state. By this time all the old *municipia* had been granted full civic rights; except where they had been reconstituted from 188 and onwards, or where new tribes had been formed in 241. Even the Latins, who, taking advantage of their privileges, had contrived to get themselves included in the civic registers in Rome or the Roman colonies, were excluded from them by successive cancellations. When Fregella, the oldest of the Latin colonies, took up arms in support of its claim to the concession of Roman citizenship, it was conquered and reduced to the status of a village (124).

Caius Gracchus, elected tribune in 123, restored the operation of the agrarian law, and secured the acceptance of a corn law (*Lex frumentaria*) by which grain was sold below cost price to the citizens resident in Rome, and of a judiciary which in most of the tribunals replaced the senators by knights (that is, by members of the first *centuriae*, from which the Roman cavalry was drawn (§ 5). This was an attempt to constitute a great coalition against the senatorial oligarchy. In his opinion, the coalition ought to have strengthened itself by including the Italic; and on being re-elected in 122, Caius proposed that Roman citizenship should be granted to the Latins, and that the rights of the Latins should be conceded to the other Italic peoples. But this new proposal encountered the hostility of the Roman *plebs*, bitterly jealous of its privileges. In 121 Caius was not re-elected; and in a conflict between the armed consular forces and his supporters the latter were defeated, while he himself was killed.

The victorious Roman oligarchy proceeded to discredit itself by its failures in the Numidian war against Jugurtha (111 *et seq.*). The ensuing reaction elected to the consulate in 107 a "new man," Caius Marius, a member of an equestrian family of Arpinum, who won the war and became leader of the democratic party. His position was strengthened by the task allotted to him—that of opposing the threatened invasion of Italy by the Germanic Cimbri and the Celtic Teutoni, who had made their way into Gaul, inflicting heavy defeats

upon the Romans. Terror spread throughout Italy; and Marius, notwithstanding the prescriptions of the law, was re-elected consul for five years in succession (104-100). The first thing he did was to reorganize the Roman army, transforming the system of recruiting the forces. The troops were now recruited even from those who possessed no property, and were paid, so that if a campaign continued for several years the soldier's calling became a real profession. The army was thus composed of "veterans," and the soldier was better trained and more experienced; at the same time, these reforms created a separate caste, which might become the personal instrument of ambitious generals; and this transformation of the army was a determining factor of the fall of the republic.

The Teutoni were defeated by Marius at Aquae Sextiae (Aix-les-Bains) in 102 and the Cimbri at the Campi Raudii near Vercellae in 101. Marius was saluted as the saviour of the *patria*.

§ 12. THE SOCIAL WAR AND THE FIRST CIVIL WAR. THE MUNICIPAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE ROMAN STATE.—In the sixth consulate of Marius, that of the year 100, the tribune Apuleius Saturninus proposed an agrarian law which provided for the division of the territory beyond the Po which had been recovered from the Cimbri, and the founding of colonies in Sicily, Africa, Greece and Macedonia. The Italic veterans were to be admitted as colonists, and in some cases they would be granted Roman citizenship. A violent conflict ensued with the nobility in Rome, and in the end Marius went over to the side of the aristocracy and attacked Saturninus, who was killed. His laws were repealed. The democratic programme was now revived by the aristocratic Marcus Livius Drusus, in respect of its two essential elements—the distribution of the *ager publicus* and the granting of Roman citizenship to the Italici. These latter supported Drusus, who obtained the acceptance of his proposals, though not without some violence; but the Senate declared them null and void. Drusus was killed and his supporters were persecuted (91).

Now the Italici of Osco-Sabellic race took up arms, detaching themselves from their alliance with Rome and setting up a federal state with a capital at Corfinium on the Pescara, in the territory of the

Paeligni, which was given the name of Italica. At the head of the league was a senate of five hundred members, and the executive power was entrusted to two consuls and twelve praetors. In the first campaign, in the year 90, the insurgents were victorious; while the Umbri and the Etruscans threatened to join the movement. Thereupon Rome, by the Julian Law (proposed by the consul Lucius Julius Caesar), granted citizen rights to those allies who had remained loyal to Rome, and the Lex Plautia Papiria (proposed by the tribunes Plautius and Papirius) extended the concession to all Italici who applied for it within sixty days. The new citizens, however, were to be inscribed in only eight of the thirty-five tribes; which, as they voted by tribes, considerably diminished their influence. The consul Pompeius Strabo granted the Latin privileges to the populations of Cisalpine Gaul. This measure ensured the loyalty of those peoples which had not yet rebelled, and induced many of the insurgents to lay down their arms. At the close of the year 89, Nola, Samnium, Lucania and Bruttium were still holding out, insisting on a programme of complete independence of Rome. The Samnites, in particular, were eager to attack Rome, declaring that they would destroy the wolf's den. At the same time the Roman power was imperilled in the East by Mithridates, king of Pontus, who invaded Asia Minor, where he was welcomed by the population, which was systematically exploited by the Roman governors and publicans (88). At his instigation all the Italians in Asia were massacred in a single day. Eighty thousand perished. Mithridates crossed into Europe, invading Macedonia and Greece. The command of the forces sent against him was conferred upon Lucius Cornelius Sulla, who was elected consul for the year 87.

In Rome itself the democratic and aristocratic factions were confronting each other in arms. The democratic party proposed that the new Italic citizens should be equally distributed among all the tribes, and deprived Sulla (who favoured the aristocracy) of his command in the war, transferring it to Marius. Sulla, who was then besieging Nola, marched upon Rome with his army and occupied the city: the first example of its kind. The democrats were put to



flight; their laws were abrogated, and the power of the tribunes and the *comitiae* was restricted. This done, Sulla set out for the East (87). The democratic party now recovered itself; the new consul, Cornelius Cinna, and Marius, with the support of the Italici, and especially of the Samnites, imposed themselves upon the senate: the laws of Sulla were abrogated, his patrimony was confiscated, and his supporters were subjected to a sanguinary vendetta. In the year 86 Marius was elected consul for the seventh time; but he died at the beginning of his consulate.

Sulla, having completely defeated Mithridates, who had to abandon all his conquests, returned to Italy (82), and made war upon the democratic party, led by Cinna and the younger Marius, still supported by the Samnites and Lucani. Sulla, having defeated them all, became the master of the city of Rome, and of the state, ruling as dictator (81). No term was set to his dictatorship. Democrats and Italici were crushed by means of imprisonment, proscription—then practised for the first time in Rome—the destruction of cities, and the confiscation of territory, which the general distributed among his soldiers. The state was reorganized by a series of oligarchic reforms which limited the power of the tribunes and the legislative powers of the *comitiae*, restoring all judicial functions to the senate, which once more became supreme. Sulla resigned his dictatorship in 79 and died a year later.

This recovery of power by the Roman aristocracy was of brief duration. In a few years' time the constitutional reforms of Sulla were all abolished, and the work of democratic restoration was begun under the leadership of Gnaeus Pompeius and Marcus Licinius Crassus, who were consuls in the year 70. In the thirty-five tribes the Italici finally won their rank of Roman citizens. A great many new *municipia* and colonies were founded: but here Sulla himself had given the initiative. While hitherto the Romans had not systematically promoted the creation of cities and municipal constitutions (but had sometimes even destroyed those which already existed), now, within some ten years, the whole Italian peninsula became covered with a network of cities with municipal privileges, to which were attributed the villages or *vici*, the castles, and the surrounding land, including what had hitherto been the *ager publicus* of the Roman people. Even

*fora* and *conciliabula* were transformed into cities. The *municipia*, new and old alike, and the colonies were uniformly reorganized with a senate or municipal council and elective magistrates—*duoviri* in the colonies and in some of the *municipia*, but *quatuorviri* in most of the *municipia*—who, beside their administrative powers, exercised the judicial power within a determined limit of competence (excluding all affairs of state and also some private causes). Thus the office of prefect was abolished, though the name of prefecture was retained by certain urban centres in which the prefects had resided, just as the nominal categories of *fora*, *conciliabula*, and *coloniae* were retained, though the cities actually differed only in their origins.

In this way was completed the transformation of Rome from a city-state to a state composed of a multiplicity of cities, with a distinction between the central government and the local authorities. It did not, however, hit upon the modern institution of representative government. Political rights continued to be exercised in Rome only, in the assemblies of citizens, so that the majority of Italian citizens were still excluded from the exercise of power. This municipal transformation of Italy was completed in the time of Julius Caesar, and was to a great extent his doing. It was he, moreover, who conferred Roman citizenship, by proclamation, on the Transpadanian (Cis-alpine) cities; a proclamation which was put into effect after his death.

§ 13. THE NEW CIVIL WARS AND THE INSTITUTION OF THE EMPIRE. THE AGE OF AUGUSTUS.—This proud achievement, the civic systematization of all Italy, was accomplished during the period of the last civil wars of the republic. It was inextricably complicated by a political element—that is, the struggle of rival classes and groups for power—and a social element—that is, the agitations deriving from the profound economic changes which were casting into the arena the impoverished and the unemployed; men who were savagely eager to enrich themselves and improve their status. It is calculated that during the last fifty years of the Republic no less than half a million persons acquired land in Italy through the redistributions provoked by the civil war. These redistributions took place whenever the victorious party confiscated the property of the vanquished and

gave it to their own followers: above all, to the soldiers who had given them the victory. These assignments of land did not mean a renaissance of small peasant proprietors, cultivating their own land. The great majority of the veterans thus endowed were town-dwellers, who had their holdings cultivated by others. In many cases the new proprietors quickly ran into debt and finally alienated their holdings, thereby promoting the formation of great territorial estates.

The political decision of the civil conflicts could only be taken in Rome, by means of its inhabitants united in the *comitiae*. The body in which sovereignty actually resided, though nominally this was extended to the whole of Italy, had become an eminently artificial structure. It was composed very largely of destitute and unoccupied persons who were living on the public donations (for in this period the distribution of food to the people, at a low price or gratuitously, was becoming systematized) or private largesse. These were naturally ready instruments in the hands of ambitious and powerful chiefs; for purposes of political agitation, for snatching votes in the *comitiae*, and for the final legalization of whatever measures might be imposed by the victorious might of the armies. These armies comprised citizens from every part of Italy, and through the armies those Italians who were not inhabitants of Rome could promote their interests and realize their aspirations.

The restoration of popular sovereignty effected by Pompey and Crassus did not mean the end of the struggle between the senatorial aristocracy, ever more obtusely conservative, and the democracy, ever more demagogic. (The knights stood midway between the two parties, leaning now to one side and now to the other, according to their capitalistic interests.) While Pompey, having suppressed the pirates who were infesting the Mediterranean, and having finally defeated Mithridates, and acquired for Rome the inheritance of the Seleucids, was establishing the dominion of Rome in the whole of the Near East to the west of the Euphrates (67-62), the Roman populace, clamouring for a social revolution, found a leader in the vicious and aristocratic adventurer, Lucius Sergius Catilina. The conspiracy of Catiline (63) was easily repressed in Rome by the consul Marcus Tullius Cicero; and in Etruria, which, owing to its economic

structure—an agrarian and mercantile capitalism—and the very extensive expropriations following the civil wars, was a breeding-ground of proletarian insurrection, the army recruited by Catiline was defeated, and its leader was slain (62).

The democratic cause was revived, with greater moderation of purpose, and greater political ability, by Caius Julius Caesar (*b.* 100), a kinsman of Marius and a son-in-law of Cinna. Elected consul in 59, he and Pompey, now returned from the East, and the enormously wealthy Crassus entered into the private agreement known as the First Triumvirate. At the end of his consulate he succeeded in obtaining and holding for ten years the government of the Gallic provinces (Gallia Cisalpina, and Gallia Narbonensis, which corresponded to the modern Provence, and which had been conquered some decades previously), making them a base for the conquest of the whole of Gaul (58–51). This signified a capital enlargement of the Roman empire, which led to the Romanization of the West, and finally established Rome as the centre of the Mediterranean world. It yielded enormous wealth to the proconsul, which he employed in the support and entertainment of his faction in Rome. There, however, Pompey, who had gone over to the senatorial party, was becoming the stronger; and Crassus having perished in the course of an unsuccessful expedition against the Parthians (53), there was at last an open rupture between the two dictators. The constituted authorities in Rome supported Pompey against Caesar, who was declared a rebel (49). Caesar's armies were victorious in Italy, Spain, Greece (in the critical battle of Pharsalia) (48) and Africa; Pompey, taking to flight, was murdered in Egypt. The conqueror became perpetual dictator with the personal title of *Imperator* (which in itself was a military title indicating supreme command), and he seems to have envisaged the uniform reorganization of all parts of the Empire under his rule, where he would have borne the title (at all events outside Italy) of king. The residual republican faction put him to death as a tyrant (15 March 44); but it failed to seize the reins of power, which became the subject of contest between the man who had been the right hand of the late dictator, Marcus Antonius, and his heir and adopted son, Caius Octavius, who assumed the name of Caius Julius Caesar Octavianus.

The second triumvirate (which, unlike the first, was officially instituted) consisted of Antony, Octavian and Lepidus. It destroyed the senatorial party by the most extensive proscriptions, of which the most illustrious victim was Cicero, and defeated the assassins of Caesar, Brutus and Cassius, at Philippi (42). It was then dissolved by the elimination of Lepidus and war between Antony and Octavian. The latter was victorious at Actium (31), after which he occupied and annexed Egypt, where Antony had established himself in power beside the Queen, Cleopatra. (Both committed suicide.) Octavian was now sole master of the empire. He thereupon proceeded, by means of decisions which he obtained without difficulty from the senate and the people, to effect a constitutional reform which concentrated in his person, though under republican forms (proconsular powers, tribunes, etc.), the supreme power in the Empire, with the technical and administrative collaboration of the senate, to which the government of some of the provinces was confided. The title of Augustus, conferred upon him in the year 27, and afterwards applied to him as a personal name, consecrated the quasi-sacred character of his person.

During the second triumvirate Gallia Cisalpina was incorporated in Italy, whose frontier was thereby advanced to the Alps, apart from a few portions of the Eastern and Western Alps. The north-western frontier was fixed by Augustus at the Arsa, an Istrian river. He divided Italy into eleven regions (or twelve with Rome): Campania (including Latium); Apulia and Calabria; Lucania and Ager Bruttius; Samnium; Picenum; Umbria; Etruria; Emilia; Liguria (which extended to the Po and the Trebbia); Venetia and Istria; Gallia Traspadana (as far as the Adda). It does not appear that these regions had any other function beyond serving as a frame of reference for the compiling of administrative data.

The period of the civil wars and the reign of Augustus was marked by the full development of Roman literature. This name relates it to the language, which became predominant, first, in non-Hellenic Italy, but then also in Greek Italy, while Etruscan and the other Italic languages gradually became extinct. But it was an Italian literature inasmuch as it was the work of writers from all parts of Italy (indeed,

hardly any were born in Rome). The influence of Hellenism in this period was powerful and decisive; nevertheless, Roman literature has original qualities of its own, contributed by great and individual writers. There were great historical writers: Sallust (Sallustius Crispus), from Sabina (*d.* 35 B.C.), a concise and pithy author, has left us the story of the Catiline conspiracy and of the Jugurthine war; Julius Caesar, in his simple and elegant style, wrote his "Commentaries" on the Gallic War, and the Civil War; Titus Livius, a Paduan (*d.* A.D. 17), was the author of a very comprehensive and eloquent history of Rome, full of republican virtues and republican greatness. With Cicero Roman eloquence, political and private, reached its zenith; he was also, in his many treatises, the greatest propagandist of Greek philosophy and culture. Catullus, a Veronese (*d.* 59 B.C.?), an original lyric poet whose work was marked by great emotional force and felicity of expression, was followed by the elegiac poets. Tibullus, a native of Latium, Propertius, who came from Assisi (both of whom died in 18 B.C.), and Ovid (Ovidius Naso) of Sulmona (*d.* A.D. 17): the last-named being an extremely prolific though not very original poet, who was the author of a famous mythological poem in hexameters: *Metamorphoses*. Didactic poetry produced a highly original work in the *De rerum natura* of Lucretius (*d.* 55 B.C.), a poem which expounds with vigorous art the maxims of the Epicurean philosophy. We find greater perfection of form and refinement of feeling in the *Georgics* of the Mantuan Publius Virgilius Maro (*d.* 19 B.C.), who in his *Aeneid* gave Rome her great national poem. Contemporary with Virgil, and like him a friend of Augustus and Maecenas, was Horatius Flaccus of Venusia (*d.* 8 B.C.), the author of odes, satires, and epistles, who, especially in the odes, dealt most effectively, and in the most individual manner, with light themes and serious—moral, patriotic and personal—in verse whose form was distinguished by its supreme refinement.

The originality of Roman literature cannot be summed up—as has often been remarked—by pointing to the specific tendencies of the Roman spirit that make for the political greatness of the city, and the so-called practical character which it reveals as compared with the speculation and imagination of Greek literature. Political

and social interests do certainly play a large part in Roman literature, but this literature also shows a development in the direction of sentiment and introspection. In Catullus, and in the elegiac poets, in Virgil and in Horace, we find a power of expressing states of mind, a depth of inward reflection, and a feeling for Nature which we might well call modern. As for the so-called practicality of Roman literature, it is before all a practical morality; it expresses a sense of duty, of justice, a pious regard for the public and private virtues, and the consciousness of a universal moral law. This human morality is predominant in the greatest writers of this period: in Cicero, Livy, Virgil, and Horace, as in their successors, Seneca and Tacitus, and it constitutes their truest title to greatness.

Again, it was the first century before Christ that saw the great development of Roman architecture, which was the Roman art *par excellence*, and which created its greatest masterpieces in public works of general utility, in streets, bridges, aqueducts, temples and theatres. In architecture the Romans were strongly influenced not only by Greek but also by Etruscan art. In the 2nd century before Christ the first marble temples were built in Rome, and in the 1st century great and magnificent buildings were erected, such as the Curia of Pompey, the Emilian basilica, the Julian basilica. Sculpture and painting were of less importance; the former betrayed a particular predilection for the realistic portrait. Both were employed more especially as decorative arts.

#### § 14. ITALY IN THE FIRST TWO CENTURIES OF THE EMPIRE.

—The imperial regime instituted by Augustus became permanent, and continued in force for five centuries, without ever entirely losing the character of the republican magistrature, and above all, without ever becoming hereditary in theory. The emperors were elected by the senate; however, in most cases its choice was a mere formality, sanctioning the accession of a candidate already designated by blood relationship or adoption, or by the proclamation of the army. Down to about the middle of the 3rd century the emperors may be grouped in series (passing over any intermediate group of very brief duration) in which we see the Roman aristocracy replaced by the Italic, and

the Italic aristocracy by the provincial. Down to the year A.D. 68 we have the Julian-Claudian emperors (Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero); from 69 to 96 the Flavian emperors (Vespasian, Titus, Domitian); from 96 to 192 the adoptive or the Antonine emperors (Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, Commodus); and then the Severi (193-235). Then followed the so-called military anarchy and the new Diocletian-Constantinian organization of the Empire.

The advent of the Empire diminished the possibility of a specific and autonomous political life for Italy, such as the development of the Romano-Italic state in the 1st century B.C. had in some degree created. Before the embryo national state could develop it made way for the universal state under a formally dyarchic government (senate and emperor), which in actual fact became more and more monarchical. From the first period of the Empire the *comitiae*—which were always, for the reasons already explained, both urban and national in character—lost, even legally, all real power. An ever-increasing number of citizens from all parts of Italy held public office—on the nomination of the senate or the emperor—or entered the senate or the equestrian order. Under the Flavian emperors the Italic nobility was definitely predominant over the Roman, which was to a great extent massacred by the second triumvirate and the Julian-Claudian emperors. In addition to the Italic nobility there was a nobility of provincial origin, which was constantly becoming more numerous. The Romano-Italic citizens were extremely jealous of their privileges and their dominating position in the Empire. For this reason Augustus and Tiberius were circumspect in granting citizenship to provincials, and Claudius had to deal with a vigorous and efficacious movement of opposition, since he tended in the contrary direction. The Italian resistance had no lasting effect. Vespasian increased the number of citizens by the urbanization of the provinces, for citizenship was conferred upon the urban magistrates. The granting of citizenship became more frequent than ever in the period of the Antonines, until under Caracalla it was generally extended to all the free inhabitants of the Empire.

The political and social equalization of Italy with the provinces was accompanied by the collaboration of the provinces in Roman culture,



which in the first two centuries of the Empire became no longer Italian but Western European. In poetry, beside the Italians Silius Italicus, an epic writer, Papinius Statius, an epic and lyric poet, Persius, Juvenal, and Petronius Arbiter, satiric poets (the two first being moralists, harshly criticizing the society of imperial Rome, while the third gave an unprejudiced representation of reality in his *Satyricon*), we find the Spaniards, Lucan, who in his *Pharsalia* introduced the politics and the history of the very recent past, and Martial, the genial epigrammatist. Another Spaniard, Seneca (the minister of Nero), was an eminent moral philosopher, and also a tragic poet. In history Italy still held pride of place with Tacitus, the famous delineator of the society of Imperial Rome (the nationality of the anecdotal historian Suetonius is unknown), in scientific prose with Pliny the Elder, and in epistolography with Pliny the Younger; but in rhetoric another Spaniard, Quintilian, was supreme, while the romance of adventure was introduced by an African, Apuleius. In the field of art Roman architecture attained its most magnificent development. Under the Empire, such native elements as the arch, the vault, and the cupola gave it a special and original character. Typical examples of Roman and Imperial architecture are the Pantheon of Agrippa, whose cupola was built under Hadrian, the Arch of Titus, the Trajan Column, the Antonine Column, the Baths of Caracalla, and of somewhat later date, the basilica of Massentius (or Constantine). During the Empire, from Julius Caesar to Trajan, the series of Imperial *fora* were built in Rome. There was a tremendous production of busts and statues of emperors and illustrious persons, and decorative paintings, adorning even the walls of private houses (of which there are characteristic examples in Pompeii).

The equalization of Italy and the provinces was in the natural order of things, and in itself it constituted a strengthening of the Empire, while Italy lost nothing by it but a little empty prestige. Not only Italy, but the whole Empire now constituted a network of cities with autonomous administration under the political direction of the centre, Rome. The question was, whether this urban life, which was constantly becoming wealthier and more resplendent, would be able to maintain itself. Under Augustus the economic prosperity of Italy touched its apex, and the Italian cities passed through their Golden Age. Urban magnificence,

thanks to the middle classes of the cities, attained majestic proportions. The government of the city was in the hands of the upper middle class, whose members performed the administrative functions without payment, and it became a tradition among them to distinguish themselves by instances of civic munificence (*munera*). In the early years of the Empire urbanization spread to the Alpine territories; thus, under Claudius the Anauni were incorporated in the *municipium* of Tridentum (Trent). Under Augustus Sicily, like Cisalpine Gaul, was practically part of Italy; there was not as yet any general concession of citizenship, but the privileges of Roman *municipia* and Latin colonies were conferred on all the principal cities. The emperors did nothing in particular to promote urbanization in Sicily. In Sardinia conditions were more backward than in Sicily, and those of Corsica, where the indigenous element was still predominant, were even more so.

The peace and order which the Empire maintained in the provinces, and the better government of the latter, led to an economic recovery of the Orient, and a development of Western economy which received its impulse from the Italic refugees during the civil wars. Italic production and commerce were thus beginning to lose their monopolistic or predominant position. The increasing cultivation of the grape and the olive in the West competed with Italic production, whose conditions were deteriorating. The medium-sized property was especially hard hit, and this gave a new impulse to its absorption by the great estates, which returned to the practice of extensive grain production. Hence an increase of the urban and rural proletariat in Italy. From the reign of Domitian (81–96) recourse was had to protectionist measures, favouring Italic viticulture to the detriment of the Western provinces; but they were not of lasting efficacy. Before the close of the 3rd century viticulture was definitely ruined as far as Italy was concerned. The process by which landed property became concentrated in the hands of the agrarian nobility was accentuated in the 2nd century of the Empire, at the cost not only of the peasants, but also of the urban middle class. Nerva and Trajan attempted to maintain and increase the number of small properties, but even under Hadrian there were signs that this was regarded as a desperate undertaking. However, this renewed development of the great estate at the expense of the small

must not be envisaged as the complete triumph of the *latifundium* operated by slave labour. On the contrary, it seems that in the 2nd century there was a revival of cultivation by leasehold tenants rather than by peasant landowners. However, the depopulation of Italy, even under the Antonines, is an undoubted fact. Some authorities have seen the principal cause of this decline in emigration, due to the fact that the Italians found it much easier to make a living in the provinces. In the course of the 2nd century Italic industry and commerce declined, while in the provinces they prospered increasingly. The Italic merchants in the East began to disappear, while Oriental merchants were becoming more and more numerous in the West.

Hence the beginning of a crisis in local finance, which was reflected in the finances of the capital, and—contemporaneously with the demands of increasing centralization and autocracy—a progressive intervention of the imperial power in the internal life of the city. Trajan inaugurated in Italy, as in the provinces, the control of municipal finances by “curators”; Hadrian instituted the *advocatus fisci*. The privilege which the Italian cities had enjoyed as against those of the provinces—that of having no intermediaries between the municipal and the central administration—was beginning to crumble, even in respect of the judiciary. Hadrian divided the peninsula into four judicial circumscriptions, placing at the head of each a *juridicus* of consular rank. This measure was abolished by Antoninus Pius, but restored by Marcus Aurelius, and it remained in force. These judges took over the judicial functions of the Roman tribunals, but not those of the municipal tribunals; nevertheless, the municipal magistrates were very soon subordinated to them. From the time of Trajan imperial commissaries were sent to the cities, on special and temporary missions, and later on these commissaries became permanent officials.

But even before these changes there was an elimination (partly due to the imperial policy, and partly, perhaps, to the inclinations of the Italian population) of the Romano-Italian element from the army. From the time of Vespasian onwards the number of soldiers recruited in Italy for the legions continually diminished (though they were still predominant in the praetorian cohorts), until under Trajan the army seems to have consisted mainly of soldiers recruited from the provinces

—for the time being from the citizen class—with a few Italians from the north. Septimus Severus (193–213) eliminated the Italians even from the praetorian guard, replacing them by provincials; so that many young Italians, being without occupation, adopted the calling of gladiator, or took to brigandage. Further, under Septimus Severus Italy ceased to enjoy the privilege of being exempt from the encampments of the legions. All these factors, taken together, resulted in the occupation of Italy by foreign troops, who disposed, more and more exclusively, of the imperial throne itself. Moreover, with Septimus Severus began that imperial policy which was directed above all to securing the support of the army by means of stipends and privileges, so that the military career became the basis of the civil, oppressing the peoples by taxation and forced prestations, while the currency was devalued in order to obtain the necessary resources for the army.

§ 15. THE LATE EMPIRE. ITALY REDUCED TO THE STATUS OF PROVINCE. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE PAPACY. —Shortly after the death of Septimus Severus began the so-called period of military anarchy, which included the middle years of the 3rd century. It was marked by the complete militarization of the Empire; the army became the absolute master, and the upper ranks of the governmental bureaucracy were largely recruited from it. And since the Italian elements were finally disappearing from the army, which consisted not only of non-Italians, but also of barbarians (drawn from the peasant class, especially in the Danubian countries), this meant that the Italians had almost entirely lost any share in the government, and had become merely the object of political activity. There were frequent reactions against this state of affairs on the part of the senate and the upper classes of the Italian population; for example, the Italian revolt against Maximinus, whose army was held up by the resistance of Aquileia, and who was slain beneath the walls of that city (238). But it was powerless to change the course of events, and the class which had governed the state in the time of the Antonines was not only excluded from the government, but was largely destroyed by the systematic massacres perpetrated by the emperors and their troops. Under these conditions the privilege of Roman citizenship which Caracalla (212)

extended to the whole Empire was of no political significance, simply because the privilege of citizenship was no longer of any value.

The military monarchy, growing more and more despotic, and the anarchy resulting from the rapid and violent succession of a whole series of emperors, and from the armed rivalry of the claimants, ended by destroying the autonomy of the cities. The intervention of imperial officials in the administration of the cities became permanent and general with the institution of the *correctores*. In the second half of the 3rd century the *corrector Italiae* made his appearance, apparently a single functionary. Septimus Severus was probably the first to establish as a norm the responsibility of the municipal magistrates to the state in respect of the collection of imposts, and also the first to transform the public prestations of the imposts, or "liturgies," into a compulsory governmental institution. The corporations of the arts and crafts began to assume the form of state institutions in respect of the public services and other prestations which were demanded of them. Their organization and operation were henceforth subject to fixed regulation and were made obligatory. Depredations on a large scale were committed by the emperors at the cost of the cities.

We have no exact information as to the economic conditions in Italy during the 3rd century; but probably the economic decadence and the depopulation which were general throughout the Empire were more accentuated and more rapid. Under Philip (244-249) brigandage was rampant in Umbria; and under Gallienus (260-268) there was a rising of peasants in Sicily. The civil wars, with all their consequences, broke out even on Italian soil; Italy was repeatedly threatened with barbarian invasions, and under Aurelian (270-275) these assumed, for a moment, a menacing aspect, inducing this emperor to build around Rome the protective wall that bears his name.

The economic and political decadence was accompanied by the decline of culture, which was almost completely sterile in the Italy of the 3rd century. In this century, however, the new Christian religion began to spread throughout Italy. The old Roman paganism was henceforth a lifeless thing, a mere matter of state tradition and ritual. A cult which had assumed considerable importance was that of the emperors, in which the political glorification of the Roman state was

blended with the Oriental worship of the prince as a divine being and a saviour of humanity, and which in the Empire had already been manifested in respect of Augustus. During the Empire a multiplicity of religions had issued from the East, which, unlike the Graeco-Roman polytheism, were cosmopolitan in character, while their aim was to assure the individual of felicity beyond the tomb. Among these religions Christianity was victorious, owing to its rational and moral superiority, and the power of its organization: urban churches governed by bishops, assisted by priests and deacons, and grouped, in the various regions, round more important churches, which were in mutual communication, so that they constituted a network covering the whole Empire. In Italy Christianity began to spread from its earliest years through the South and to Rome; in the capital there was a flourishing Christian community by the middle of the 1st century. It enjoyed great prestige, not only in respect of its memories of the preaching and the martyrdom of the two chief Apostles—whose bodies were venerated by the community—but by reason of the natural increase which it owed to its location in the capital of the Empire. The development of Christianity in Northern Italy was of later date. Persecutions, partial and occasional—bloody in Rome under Nero—and a general persecution in the middle of the 3rd century, did not prevent the spread and the triumph of the new religion.

At the end of the 3rd century the Empire, which had been in danger of disintegration under the attacks of the barbarians, was reconstituted by the emperors Claudius II and Aurelian (268–275). Diocletian (284–305) gave it a more stable and organic structure, and his work was continued by Constantine the Great (306–337). Restoration under Diocletian and Constantine represented the final transformation of the Empire into an absolute bureaucratic monarchy; and this transformation meant that Italy no longer had any special and individual place in the Empire: the country was placed absolutely on a par with the province, beginning with the imposts. It was included in the new division of the Empire into prefectures, under the *praefectus praetorio*, the prefectures being divided into dioceses, under the *vicarii*, and the dioceses into provinces, under the *praesides*. Italy constituted one diocese of the prefecture of Italy (with the *praefectus praetorio* resident

in Milan, the new seat of Empire for the West), the other dioceses being Illyria and Africa. The Italian diocese was larger than Augustan Italy: in the north it comprised the Cottian Alps and trans-Alpine Rhaetia, and included the three islands. Not all the provinces into which Italy was divided (with a few variations in respect of the Augustan regions, and an increase in number effected in the course of the 4th century) were subject to the vicar of Italy, but only those northern provinces which were known as "annonary" provinces, because they had to pay tribute to provide for the maintenance of the imperial court. The provinces of Central and Southern Italy, on the other hand, known as *urbicariae* or *suburbicariae*, were subject to the *vicarius urbis* resident in Rome, and their tributes went to Rome. During the 4th century certain tracts of "suburbicarian" Italy were added to "annonarian" Italy, evidently in order to increase the resources of the Court. Rome retained an administration of her own, under the prefect of the city, and the jurisdiction of the senators was confined to the city; so that the senate was little more than a town council. The new seat of Empire, Constantinople (330), the work of Constantine, was becoming more important than Rome.

The Empire now constituted a bureaucratic and hierarchic organism, rigorously centralized—at all events, on paper. The Italian cities, directly subject to the governors of the provinces, suffered the complete loss of their autonomy. They still retained their municipal council or *curia*, but the members of the *curia* (*decurioni*) did little more than receive the imposts. Owing to the decline of economic production the state applied the extremest pressure in demanding tribute, which still further aggravated the sterilization of production. The tributary system instituted by Diocletian fixed for each circumscription the total amount of the imposts, which were distributed by the local authorities. In view of the power of the great landowners the burden had come to rest mainly on the colonists—on whom the owners of the *latifundia* levied the imposts—and the small landowners. From the latter were drawn the *decurioni*, who were responsible to the fisc, to the extent of their whole fortune, for the imposts due to the urban community. In view of this grave responsibility they were naturally loth to take office. But the law made the office obligatory and hereditary, just as the

artisans' membership of the trade corporations was obligatory and hereditary. In the same way, military service was compulsory for the sons of soldiers settled on their own land, while the colonists were tied to the soil—*adscripti glebae*.

A new institution of capital importance was the Catholic Church. Under Constantine it obtained full recognition and a privileged position, and in the course of the 4th century it became the state Church, and its faith the only recognized and accepted religion (apart from the privileges of the Jews, and special tolerances in respect of heretic barbarians in the service of the Empire). Subsequently, from the time of Theodosius, paganism and heresy became crimes against the state. The ecclesiastical organization was perfected, modelling itself closely upon the civil organization; the episcopal dioceses of each imperial province formed an ecclesiastical circumscription under a metropolitan. The ecclesiastical provinces in their turn were gathered into larger units (but these did not uniformly correspond with the secular division into dioceses), round a few super-metropolitan sees, and the largest of these constituted the patriarchates: Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem (the latter being of less importance). The Councils of the Church assembled the bishops of one or more provinces to discuss affairs of greater importance; those which included all the churches of the Empire (at the prompting of the emperor) were known as Oecumenical Councils. The influence of the bishops was great, even in the secular field, especially in Italy and the West. We have a signal example in Saint Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, towards the close of the 4th century, who was councillor and censor under several emperors, among whom was Theodosius.

In the West the only Patriarch was the Bishop of Rome, who was afterwards given the specific title of Pontiff (*pontifex*) or Pope. He claimed for himself not only an honorary primacy, but also an effective supremacy of control over the whole Catholic world, as the successor of the Apostle Peter, to whom Christ had confided the power of the keys (that is, of loosing and binding the conscience of the faithful and of governing the Christian flock). These principles were affirmed with characteristic energy by Pope Leo I, known as Leo the Great (440–461), whom an edict of Valentinian III (445) recognized as Primate of the



Western Church. In this manner Rome acquired in the religious and ecclesiastical field the importance which she had been losing in the political field. The Bishop of Rome was the sole metropolitan of Central and Southern Italy, with a numerous body of bishops dependent upon him; while Northern Italy—where the bishops, however, were rather less numerous—was divided, in the 5th century, between the metropolitans of Milan, Aquileia, and Ravenna.

The Bishops of Rome won great prestige by their championing of the doctrine recognized as orthodox in the theological disputes of the time. In the disputes relating to the Trinitarian problem, which was debated in the 4th century, they contributed to the triumph of the dogma (proclaimed at the first Oecumenical Council of Nicaea in 325) of the perfect divinity of the Son of God, as against the Arian doctrine, which held that He was inferior to the Father. In the Christological disputes of the 4th century as to the relation between the divinity and humanity of Christ they were opposed to Nestorianism, which seemed to emphasize His human nature at the expense of His divinity, and also Eutichianism, and its more attenuated form of Monophysism, which tended in the opposite direction, so that Christ's humanity was absorbed by His divinity. Leo the Great witnessed the triumph of his doctrine of the "two natures" (Diophysism), neither mingled nor divided, at the fourth Oecumenical Council of Chalcedon (451). He was not, however, so successful in his opposition to the tendency of the Church of Constantinople, the seat of the Empire, to rival the authority of the Roman Church; a tendency which the same Council ratified by recognizing its supremacy over the dioceses of Thrace, Asia, and Pontus, and the second rank among the churches.

The influence of the Christian Church was manifesting itself in the field of culture, which by the end of the Empire was becoming largely ecclesiastical. There were few profane writers of eminence in the 4th and 5th centuries, and of these none were Italian. The old literary culture now flourished in Gaul rather than in Italy. The new ecclesiastical literature—which in its form had borrowed largely from the classic rhetoric—was, on the other hand, cultivated in Italy as well as abroad: episcopal homilies and sermons (one may mention St. Zeno of Verona, St. Gaudentius of Brescia, St. Peter Christologos of

Ravenna, St. Maximus of Turin); exegetical, moral, ascetic, dogmatic treatises (St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, St. Jerome), and hymns celebrating the mysteries of the Redemption, the feast of the Church, the martyrs (St. Ambrose, St. Paulinus Episcopus). At the instigation of Pope Damasius, St. Jerome also undertook a new translation of the Bible into Latin, which afterwards became known as a classic, and the official text, under the name of the Vulgate.

The death of Theodosius (395) was followed by the administrative division of the Empire into the Eastern Empire (with the seat of government in Constantinople) and the Western. Since the days of Diocletian it had already been almost customary to divide it thus, but now the division became permanent, although the political unity of the empire was maintained in theory. The Empire of the West had been largely occupied by the Barbarians, and its effective power of government was steadily diminishing. Almost the whole of Gaul, Spain, and Africa were occupied and governed by the Barbarians, although in the majority of cases they had established themselves as *foederati* of the Empire, recognizing in theory the suzerainty of the latter, and its jurisdiction over Roman citizens. Italy was spared any permanent occupation until the time of Odoacer: though she suffered the invasion of the Goths under Alaric—which resulted in the removal of the capital from Milan to Ravenna—and the capture of Rome (410); the incursion of the Huns under Attila, which was checked on the line of the Po (452), and the taking of Rome by the Vandals (under Genseric, 455). Already masters of Africa, the Vandals occupied Sicily and Sardinia, and their corsairs ravaged the Italian coast. The last twenty years of the Empire of the West saw an exceptionally rapid succession of important emperors, most of whom were in the power of the Barbarian general Ricimer; but the emperor in Constantinople still exercised a certain power of suzerainty over Italy, and over and over again he appointed his Western colleague. One of the emperors thus nominated, Julius Nepos, was dethroned by Orestes, who had succeeded to Ricimer in the command of the army, but he held out for a time in Dalmatia. Orestes had his young son Romulus acclaimed emperor by the soldiery (October 475), whereupon he assumed the name of Augustus; or, as the people called him, Augustulus. The Barbarian soldiers (Heruli, Scyrri

and Turcilingi) who had raised Romulus to the throne now asked Orestes to grant them territory in Italy, so that they could settle there, as the other Barbarians had settled elsewhere in the Empire. Orestes refused their request, whereupon they acclaimed as king one of their captains, Odoacer, who was probably a Scyrrian (23 August 476). Orestes shut himself up in Pavia, which was captured and burnt; he succeeded in escaping, but was killed at Piacenza. Ravenna surrendered, and Romulus Augustulus was pensioned and banished from the city. He was the last of the Emperors of the West, and it is usual to reckon that with the year 476 the old order ended, and the Middle Ages began.

## CHAPTER III

### *OSTROGOTHS AND BYZANTINES*

§ 16. ODOACER AND THEODORIC.—The destruction of the Empire of the West—for Britain, Africa, Spain and Gaul were lost, while Illyria (the Balkan peninsula) was surrendered to the Empire of the East—had left Italy isolated: and by this very fact she reacquired a distinct individuality. When Odoacer made himself master of the country the frontiers of Italy were almost identical with those of the Empire of the West. The Roman populations of Gaul and Spain were henceforth detached from the Empire; they were no longer in any sort of relation to the peoples of Italy, and they entered upon a process of rapid fusion with the Germanic invaders. It followed from this that “Roman” and “Italian” began once more to become identical terms, as in the last stage of the Republic. The identity was not understood in the sense that the Roman was absorbed in the Italian, but rather in the opposite sense. The Italians were now Romans: that is, they were citizens of the Empire, or the “Republic,” as they still called it. Not only did the imperial ideal persist, but also the juridical conception: Italy was henceforth part of the Empire, not only for the Italians, but also for the Barbarians. Odoacer and Theodoric were in law, as in intent, the vicars of the Empire. The separation from the Empire which occurred in Gaul and Spain, the definite severance between the Roman population and the Germanic settlers, and the resulting emergence of a new nation, did not take place in Italy.

Odoacer became the master of Italy in August 476 because the Barbarian troops in the service of the Empire had proclaimed him their king, and at their head he succeeded in defeating and slaying Orestes and deposing Romulus Augustulus. But he was king of the Barbarians only; and in order to regularize his position in respect of the Romans he sent an embassy from the Roman senate to the Emperor Zeno (474-491) in Constantinople, proposing that he,

Odoacer, should govern Italy in the one Emperor's name, with the rank of patrician. The first response to this proposal was not favourable, though in the end Zeno resigned himself to the situation. In the meantime Odoacer governed the Romans as patrician and supreme official of the Empire in Italy, and he did not exercise the specific rights of the emperor to promulgate laws or coin gold. The civil administration, central and provincial, like that of the city of Rome, remained intact, and was exercised by Romans in accordance with the Roman laws. As regards the economy of the country, Odoacer naturally had to make assignments of land to the Barbarian troops, in response to their demand. By so doing he was extending to Italy a measure which had already been applied on behalf of the federated Barbarians for something like a century in the various regions of the Empire. Even in Italy the Barbarian soldiers could dispose of one-third of the houses in the garrison towns. Now this measure was extended to the land, and temporary use was transformed into permanent ownership.

Odoacer was an Arian, and the majority of his Barbarian subjects must have been Arians. However, he left the situation of the Roman Church intact, and hardly ever concerned himself with ecclesiastical affairs. A few years after his rise to power, in 484, there was a breach between the Church of Rome and the Church of Constantinople, in consequence of the so-called Acacian heresy, which took its name from Acacius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, who had suggested that the Emperor Zeno should promulgate an edict (*enotikon*) which, in order to promote reconciliation with the Monophysites, would ignore the Council of Chalcedon. Odoacer took no part in the dispute; but he must have profited by the breach between Rome and Byzantium, a quarrel in which the latent aversion of the Romans to being governed by Constantinople was plainly manifested.

Odoacer's government as territorial ruler included the whole of continental Italy, and to this he added Sicily, which was restored by Genseric on the payment of tribute, and also Dalmatia, after the death of Julius Nepos (480). But in 480 the King of the Visigoths, Euric, took possession of Provence, so that in this direction Italy was reduced to her geographical frontier. A few years later (487) he marched into Noricum (the region corresponding very nearly to the modern Repub-

lic of Austria, less the Tyrol) to oppose the Rugii, who were threatening the frontier, but on being defeated he abandoned his occupation of the country. The lack of a territorial bulwark on the north-eastern confines, always the most open of Italy's frontiers, facilitated the expedition of Theodoric.

The Empire had not renounced its hope of reasserting on Italian soil a more immediate jurisdiction than the *de facto* independent vicariate of Odoacer; and its aspirations found support in the demand for new territory made by those Ostrogoths who for some time past had been settled in the Balkan peninsula as *foederati* of the Empire. Their leader, Theodoric, had spent some years of his childhood in Constantinople, as a hostage, and there he obtained some knowledge of politics. Now, after many vicissitudes, he had assured his twofold position as Barbarian chief and *magister militum* of the Empire. Zeno having given his approval to Theodoric's plan of wresting Italy from Odoacer, the Ostrogoth began his campaign in the late summer of 488, reinforced by the remnants of the Rugii, whose king, Frederick, had taken refuge with him. In the summer of 489 the Gepidae were defeated on the Save; then, crossing the eastern frontier of Italy, he defeated Odoacer on the Isonzo (28 August), and at Verona (at the end of September), thus making himself the master of Northern Italy, while Odoacer shut himself up in Ravenna. The Italian population split in two; one part remained faithful to Odoacer, while the other—including the Roman senate—recognized Theodoric as the emperor's envoy. After a temporary recovery, Odoacer was again defeated on the Adda (11 August 490), and once more shut himself up in Ravenna, where he held out for nearly three years. At last an agreement was concluded, whose exact provisions are unknown to us. Theodoric, on the strength of this agreement, entered Ravenna and slew Odoacer (March 493), alleging treachery as a pretext, and massacred his fellow-soldiers and supporters. The Ostrogoths acclaimed him as their king.

§ 17. THEODORIC.—Theodoric, unlike Odoacer, took possession of Italy under the emperor's commission. Probably the limits of his power were left indeterminate. He too had recourse to an embassy of the Roman senate to Constantinople in order to regularize his

position; but the new emperor, Anastasius I (491-518), was hostile to him, and not until some years later (perhaps in 497) was it possible to come to an agreement. The emperor sent to Theodoric the purple and the other royal insignia which Odoacer had returned to Constantinople, thereby officially acknowledging him as the supreme representative of the imperial authority in Italy. Theodoric therefore appointed all officials, including a consul, issued regulations (but did not promulgate laws), and struck coins (but only by exception gold), and in general exercised the full executive and judicial power. At the same time, by the proclamation of his people, he was sovereign of the Ostrogoths and commander of the Barbarian army. The whole system of government was permeated by this dualism. The civil administration remained entirely Roman, in its institutions and its personnel, while the army was exclusively Ostrogothic, and in the army the Gothic nation continued to govern itself through its own chiefs and tribunals. It was one of the privileges of the Goths that in disputes between them and the Romans a Gothic judge adjudicated (that is, a military judge), with the sole assistance of a Roman assessor. On the other hand, the law, even for the Goths, was Roman, except in respect of personal and family relations; and even in this case the Gothic institutions were modified by Roman influences. Thus even the military organization, though confined to the Goths, retained, at all events in the higher grades, the Roman structure and Roman names. In the higher grades of the civil government, side by side with the official posts of the Roman government, which were held by Romans, there were Goths who were attached to the personal service of the king, and who formed a species of crown council, while the civil administration of the provinces (which was Roman) was controlled by the king by means of Gothic officials, known as *saioni* (corresponding to the *agentes in rebus* of the imperial organization); through them the king (to whom this title was given even by the Romans and the emperor himself) exercised his power of supreme protection (*tuitio*) to which any subject could appeal. This dualism, however, was not absolute; instances were not lacking in which the two elements, Roman and Gothic, were closely intermingled. Nevertheless, the differences of race, language, and religion remained acute; and the object of Theo-

doric's personal rule was not the fusion of the two peoples; he wished merely that they should live together in peace, and in a mutual interchange of services: the Goths defended Italy with their arms, and the Italians supported them with the products of the soil. Yet it must have been the king's intention that the Roman civilization should be adopted even by the Goths. The position of Italy under the Goths was intermediate between that of the new Romano-Barbaric kingdoms and the provinces directly subject to the Empire. It was a position of unstable equilibrium which might result either in the return of Italy to the status of imperial province, or in complete autonomy, and the formation of an entirely new kind of state, based on the fusion of Romans and Barbarians.

Theodoric began once more to distribute one-third of the soil to the Goths. This distribution, however did not equal that already made by Odoacer, since a good proportion of the lands distributed under the latter came into the hands of the new holders through the death or spoliation of the former owners. Nevertheless, as the Ostrogoths were more numerous than Odoacer's soldiery, the Italian population had to part with still more of its soil; but as far as we know the new distribution was effected without causing excessive discontent, thanks to the skill and the sense of justice manifested by the Roman patrician, Liberius, to whom it was entrusted. The Gothic troops were not uniformly distributed in all parts of Italy, but were settled mainly in the north and the east, where they would be nearer to the frontiers and to the seat of royalty. Sicily, with nearly the whole of Southern Italy, and Latium were still without Gothic colonization. The territory exempted from the cession of the *tertia* must have continued to pay the impost already imposed on landed property for the maintenance of the Barbarian troops (*fiscus barbaricus*).

On the whole, the economic and social conditions did not undergo any revolutionary change. As before, they were based upon the existence of the great estates, and a rigid distinction of classes. But in the upper class of society, side by side with the Roman majority, there was now a Gothic minority. To the system of the impost, that relic of the Empire, Romans and Goths were equally subjected; but it may well be that in practice the latter endeavoured to profit by their strength,



at the cost of the former. The great Roman landowners must have felt the effects of a power which was stronger than that of the now decadent Empire, and a power which was alien to them, and therefore more inclined to protect the small landowners and the colonists. The fact that the Gothic government took measures to ensure that corn should be sold at a fairly low price points to an economic policy which was meant to favour the lower classes.

At the beginning of Theodoric's government the economic conditions of Italy were most deplorable, on account of the war between the two contending parties, and the accompanying Barbarian invasions, including one of the Burgundi, who ravaged the north of Italy as far as Emilia. Theodoric did what he could to alleviate the sufferings of the people, in which he had the help of the bishops, especially that of St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Pavia, who went to Burgundy in order to ransom the enslaved Italians. After the first few years there was an economic revival, a contributory factor of which was the state of public security, which had been restored to an extent that seemed wonderful to contemporary observers. Unemployment was alleviated by the great public works which were completed under Theodoric, more especially in Ravenna and Rome. In the latter city the king spared no expense in the matter of preserving the ancient buildings, and he continued the imperial traditions, even to the distribution of victuals at reduced prices, or gratuitously. He also provided for the continuance of the traditional sports of the circus. In the year 500 he himself visited Rome, and was welcomed with great solemnity by the senate, the clergy, and the people, who acclaimed him as a new Trajan. This epithet alone shows that the ideal of Rome and the Empire had retained its vitality; and it finds expression also in certain coins of Theodoric's reign, on which "*Roma invicta*" is figured, with a helmet upon her head.

In the field of culture there was complete continuity between the age of Theodoric and that of the Empire. Under Theodoric, indeed, there was a certain renaissance of classic literature, in which some of his officials played a leading part. Severinus Boetius and Cassiodorus Senator are famous names. The first, who rose to be consul, was a great student of the ancient philosophy. He endeavoured to impart

its elements to his fellow-countrymen, and some of his writings were in use as manuals throughout the Middle Ages. He was also a student of Catholic theology, but his approach to the subject was mainly philosophical (as we see in his most famous work, *De consolazione philosophiae*). The second was Theodoric's secretary, with the title of *quaestor*. He drafted letters and ordinances for the king, in a florid, involved and rhetorical style (*Variae*). He too became consul and *magister officiorum*, and after Theodoric's death *praefectus praetorio*. In support of Theodoric's policies he wrote a history of the Goths, in which he exalted the Gothic people, and the race of the Amali. He wrote also a *Cronaca*, extending from the beginning of the world down to his own time. Later, after he had retired from active life, he wrote a commentary on the Psalms, and a sort of encyclopaedia of sacred and profane knowledge.

Besides Rome and Ravenna, the flourishing city of Milan was a centre of Italian culture under Theodoric. The most eminent representative of Milanese culture was Ennodius, who became Bishop of Pavia. Most of his literary productions (oratorical exercises, epigrams, letters) are profane in character and highly rhetorical. His panegyric of Theodoric, and his biography of St. Epiphanius, are important as historical documents.

In the ecclesiastical field Theodoric continued the line taken by Odoacer: complete respect for the liberty and the privileges of the Roman Church, and no proselytism, nor any measures favouring the Gothic Church. Being an Arian, he had no thought of claiming in respect of ecclesiastical affairs the office of imperial vicar which he held in respect of profane affairs; and this very fact accentuated the distinction between Church and State, and the independence of the former. But since at this time there was an embittered conflict between the Emperor Anastasius and Pope Gelasius I (492-496), who insisted on the privileges of the clergy, and the primacy of the Roman Church over the Empire in all matters of faith, Theodoric suffered no political injury from his independence of the Church. When on the death of Anastasius II, the successor to Gelasius, a schism broke out in Rome, with the twofold election of Laurentius, who favoured an agreement with Constantinople, and Symmachus (498-514), the Roman Church

itself appealed to Ravenna for a decision; and Theodoric decided in favour of Symmachus, who was elected by a majority. When the new Pope's adversaries accused him before the king of immorality and dissipating the possessions of the Church, Theodoric had to intervene anew; but although he suspended Symmachus provisionally from his functions, he referred the decision to an Italian Council which he convoked in Rome. This, in the face of the Pope's refusal to recognize its jurisdiction, declared itself incompetent to judge the Bishop of Rome, who had no superior, and restored Symmachus to his office (501), thus refraining from asserting the authority of the national Council, as the king had given it an opportunity of doing. The supporters of Laurentius, taking up arms, held out for about a year in Rome, until Theodoric decided to intervene, compelling them to accept the verdict of the Council.

§ 18. RELATIONS WITH THE EMPIRE AND THE FRANKS. THE CRISIS OF THE REGIME.—In his foreign policy Theodoric guided by two principles; he sought to maintain good relations with the Empire, and also to ensure, within the formal bond of dependence, that he was sufficiently powerful in comparison with the Empire, thanks to his good relations with the other Barbarian states of the West, in respect of which he endeavoured to act as a sort of supreme arbitrator. This Western policy found its most obvious expression in matrimonial alliances. The king gave a sister of his in marriage to the king of the Vandals, Thrasamond (and the Vandals were no longer paid tribute by Sicily); he married a sister of Clovis, the King of the Franks; he gave one of his daughters in marriage to Sigismund, the son of Gundobad, the king of the Burgundi, and another to Alaric, the King of the Visigoths. Nevertheless, the equilibrium of the West was destroyed by the successful war which Clovis waged against Alaric II (507), as a result of which the greater part of Visigothic Gaul fell into the hands of the victor. Theodoric then intervened, governing the Visigothic kingdom through a lieutenant who ruled in the place of Amalaric, the son of Alaric II, and a minor. An attempted coalition against Theodoric on the part of Clovis and the Emperor Anastasius, at the instigation of the latter, was immediately checked by

the measures which Theodoric took against the two parties. He occupied and retained Provence as part of Italy: thereby achieving a sort of partial reconstitution of the Empire of the West, but on his own account, and not on that of the Empire. However, while this policy of his did not lead to any lasting results outside Italy, it did nothing to consolidate his position at home, for it distracted him from what should have been his historic task of forming in Italy a new autonomous state, a task which Clovis was able to achieve in Gaul.

For the time being Theodoric's policy appeared to be completely successful, and in the second decade of the century it reached its apogee. Normal relations had been re-established with the Emperor Anastasius, and his successor, Justin (518-527), sanctioned Theodoric's choice of his successor—the Spaniard Eutharic, the husband of his daughter Amalasuntha. This confirmed the Italian people in the notion that Theodoric's government was merely dependent upon the Empire, especially when the dispute between Rome and Constantinople was disposed of. This was the work of Justin, or rather of his nephew Justinian, who was really at the head of the imperial government. By an agreement (519) between Pope Hormisdas on the one hand, and on the other hand the Empire and the Eastern Church, by which the latter abandoned the cause of Acacius, the schism was composed, and the agreement was followed by close relations between the imperial court and the Roman Curia. Many Italians now began to look toward Constantinople. However, the first few years after the conclusion of the religious pact, which had been supported by Theodoric, passed without political disturbances; so that the Gothic king was able to extend his dominion in Southern Gaul when the Burgundian kingdom was annexed by one of the two sons of Clovis. But the disappearance of this kingdom isolated Theodoric between the Frankish kingdom, which was becoming more and more powerful, and the Empire, which was reverting to its Western policy. This isolation was increased when in Africa, under King Hilderic (523), a philo-Catholic and philo-Byzantine policy was initiated which resulted in an immediate breach with the court of Ravenna.

Amidst the latent hostility and suspicion that had arisen between Theodoric and the Italians, as a result of the new political situation, a

number of charges of high treason were brought against notables of the Roman aristocracy. The first to be accused and condemned to death was the patrician Albinus; and Boetius, then *magister officiorum*, having defended him, was also found guilty, banished to Upper Italy, and finally put to death (524 or 525). In the interval between his condemnation and his death Boetius wrote a small volume of mixed prose and verse, *De consolatione philosophiae*, in which Philosophy appears to comfort him, persuading him of the vanity of all material things to the spirit which has achieved self-mastery. His father-in-law, Symmachus, was also put to death. The majority of the Roman Senate submitted and pronounced the sentences of death; but henceforth the breach between the Roman aristocracy and the Gothic kingdom was complete.

The political conflict resulted in a religious breach. The emperor Justin had taken measures against the Arians in Constantinople; Theodoric intervened in their defence, and compelled the Pope, John I, to repair to Constantinople, as the bearer of his petitions. The pontiff was welcomed with pious affection, but he returned from Constantinople without having achieved all that Theodoric had expected of him, and the king kept him a prisoner in Ravenna. He died a few days later (May 526), and was regarded as a martyr to Arianism. In the election of his successor, Felix IV, Theodoric, abandoning his usual ecclesiastical policy, intervened in a decisive manner. It was said that he had prepared a decree which would deliver the Catholic Church into the hands of the Arians. But before the alleged (and probably in-existent) decree could be issued he died in Ravenna, on the 30 August 526.

He was succeeded by Athalaric, the son of Eutharic (who had died some years previously) and Amalusuntha; the latter governed as regent, reverting to the old policy of the kingdom; she re-established good relations with the Roman population and the Church, obtained from Byzantium the confirmation of the new government, and appointed Cassiodorus to be her prime minister. But a spirit of opposition to this Romanophile tendency awakened in the Gothic army; and Amalasuntha was compelled to abandon her intention of giving her son a Roman education. Nevertheless, she was able to remain in power;

but on the premature death of Athalaric (534), feeling the necessity of obtaining support from the old Gothic aristocracy, she married her cousin Theodatus, a great Tuscan landowner, who, being entirely devoted to his studies, seemed likely to favour her pro-Roman tendencies. Amalasuntha had thought to retain the effective power entirely in her own hands; but Theodatus seized the power for himself, banished Amalasuntha to an island in the Lago di Bolsena, and had her assassinated.

§ 19. THE IMPERIAL RECONQUEST OF ITALY.—Justinian I (527-565), who on ascending the throne was already, to a great extent, the virtual ruler of the Empire, prepared to carry out his programme of the civil, military and ecclesiastical reconstitution of the Romano-Christian Empire. Two possible courses could be followed in such an undertaking: the Empire might endeavour to restore its power in the West, or it might concentrate its forces in the European and Asiatic East. The true mission of the Byzantine Empire lay in this second direction: Justinian chose the first, though circumstances were unfavourable to the Empire, and the necessary forces were lacking. He therefore proceeded to destroy the Gothic kingdom, with its possibilities of development in the direction of an Italian nation, though he failed to replace it by any complete and stable system of government.

In the civil order, Justinian's Romanism was justified mainly by the great undertaking of the codification of the Roman law; and in this direction he achieved lasting results, which were of great future importance for the whole of Occidental civilization. A commission of jurisconsults, under the presidency of Tribonian, collated and systematized all the laws then in force in the *Codex Justinianus*, and compiled a manual of law (*Institutiones*), and a series of extracts from the most authoritative jurists of the first three centuries of the Empire (*Digestum* and *Pandectae*). This threefold work constituted the *Corpus Juris*, which is still of fundamental importance to the study of law. It was published between 529 and 534.

Notwithstanding this great Roman achievement, it was during the reign of Justinian that the Hellenization and Orientalization of the Empire began to reveal itself; he himself adopted the Greek language

in the laws which he promulgated after the compilation of the *Codex (Novellae)*, and the Greek tongue gradually became the general and official language throughout the Empire, supplanting the Latin tongue. Thus, after the intermediate period of the "Late Empire" the Byzantine Empire properly so-called emerged, though it continued to call itself "Roman," and to regard itself, above all in Italy, as the heir of ancient Rome, and, in this quality, to intervene in Italian affairs for five hundred years to come, exercising, in Italy, a certain beneficent and civilizing influence, but on the whole constituting an obstacle to the normal development of Italian life.

The programme of restoration in the West was initiated by Justinian with the conquest of the Vandal kingdom by Belisarius (533-534). Then, Amalasuntha having been assassinated in the meantime, Justinian made this crime a pretext for intervention against Theodatus. The victorious Belisarius crossed from Africa into Sicily, which he conquered without difficulty, since the Gothic garrisons were few and far apart, and the great Roman landowners declared in his favour. The same thing happened over a great part of Southern Italy, until the imperial troops came to Naples, where they found the gates closed against them. The siege was prolonged; and once the city was taken it was treated with great severity. Theodatus, who had not succoured the Neapolitans, was deposed from the command of the Gothic army, and was slain as he was fleeing from Rome to Ravenna. The new king, Vitiges, a valiant warrior, prepared to defend his throne, and at the same time, in order to legitimize his election, he married Matasuntha, the sister of Alaric. For the time being he fell back on Ravenna, and the Romans, with Pope Silverius at their head, suddenly appealed to Belisarius, who entered the city in December 576.

In the spring of 537 Vitiges moved against Belisarius with a great army, and laid siege to Rome. Belisarius, profiting by the fortifications of the city, and his technical superiority over the Goths, resisted successfully, and a year later Vitiges retired and retreated upon Ravenna. Central Italy, also, apart from a few towns, was lost to the Goths. In Northern Italy the Goths had summoned the Franks to help them, surrendering Provence to the latter. The Franks came, slaying and ravaging on their own account. However, a body of

Frankish troops assisted Uraia, the nephew of Vitiges, against Milan, where the Byzantines, to whom the Milanese had appealed, had arrived from Genoa. The city was obliged to capitulate before the overwhelming strength of the Franco-Gothic forces. It was razed to the ground, and the inhabitants were put to the sword or sold as slaves (539). For long afterwards the once flourishing city of Milan was only a memory. This partial success did not suffice to save the Gothic kingdom which was now restricted to Ravenna, to which Belisarius laid siege. Vitiges capitulated, and Belisarius installed the imperial government in the Gothic capital (540).

Various important nuclei of Gothic warriors remained, especially in Northern Italy. After the ephemeral reigns of Ildibad and Heraric they gathered about the valiant Gothic warrior, Baduila, who is better known as Totila. He seems to have had some comprehension of the fundamental political problem of an understanding between the Gothic army and the Italian population. Profiting by the fact that the Byzantine administration, almost immediately after its restoration, had suppressed the autonomy of the Italians, and had subjected them to the harshest taxation, Totila embarked upon a work of propaganda which was calculated to persuade the Italians of the superiority of the Gothic government. The old nobility—that is, the great landowners—were attached by tradition and interest alike to the Byzantine party; and the Gothic king received a better hearing from the lower classes of the population. He favoured the colonists in particular, exempting them from the prestations which they had paid to the landowners, whom he expropriated, as they were adherents of the imperial party. Nevertheless, this did not sensibly increase his strength, apart from a certain number of slaves who deserted their masters and enrolled themselves in the Gothic army. The Gothic forces continued to diminish, while the imperial army received fresh reinforcements from Constantinople.

For some years, however, the Empire, with its traditional dilatoriness, did not provide sufficient reinforcements, and Belisarius, sent against Totila with an insufficient force, was unable to check his advance. Naples and Rome itself again fell into the hands of the Goths. Belisarius succeeded in re-entering the latter city, and was again



besieged, but at last he withdrew from Italy (548). Totila recaptured Rome (550), and for about a year, apart from a few fortresses, he was the absolute master of Italy. Nevertheless, when an elderly court official, the eunuch Narses, was despatched to Italy with a great army, Totila failed to check his advance along the marshy coasts of Venetia. Narses reached Ravenna, and then took the road to Rome. Crossing the Apennines in the Umbrian marches, probably between Scheggia and Gualdo Tadino (the name of the place is given as *Busta Gallorum*), Totila was defeated and slain on the field of battle (early summer, 552). The Goths rallied in Southern Italy under their new king, Teias; but they were again defeated on the banks of the Sarno, in the plain between Vesuvius and Monte Lattaro (1 October 552), when Teias was slain. There followed an invasion of Franks and Alamanni (a people tributary to the Franks), under the Alamann leaders Leutari and Butilinus (553), who subjected almost the whole of Italy to the most horrible devastation. In the end the invaders were destroyed by the plague and the troops of Narses (554), and once more the whole of Italy was subjected to the imperial government.

§ 20. ITALY UNDER BYZANTINE ADMINISTRATION.—Justinian took the precaution of regularizing the transition from the Gothic dominion to the restoration of the empire by a special law, the Pragmatic Sanction (554). In it were recognized the Gothic ordinances down to and including the reign of Vitiges; but the measures introduced by Totila, denominated “the Tyrant,” were annulled. He was regarded as a usurper, inasmuch as his power had never received the imperial legitimation. Italy was now once more a province of the Empire, its status being that of a Roman prefecture governed from Constantinople. It did not include Sicily, which remained directly dependent on Constantinople, as a sort of private imperial domain; nor yet Sardinia, nor Corsica, which were dependent on the government of Africa. At the head of the government was the *praefectus praetorio*, who was despatched from Constantinople; the governors of the provinces, on the other hand, were drawn from among the local nobility, and were elected by the lay and ecclesiastical magnates. The power of these civil functionaries was, as a matter of fact, reduced almost to nullity, for in

the state of war which continued almost without interruption, owing to the successive Longobard invasions, power was concentrated in the hands of the commanders of the imperial troops, who were subsequently given the name of "exarchs," and their subordinates, or *duces*, who commanded the troops in the various provinces. The exarch finally became a sort of vicar imperial; that is, he was very much what Odoacer and Theodoric were in theory, with this difference, however, that the exarch was a temporary governor, and removable at the emperor's pleasure, and had not, like the Barbarian kings, an army of his own.

On the governors of the provinces fell the duty of imposing and collecting the tributes, which weighed heavily on the population. (Any remissions of imposts granted were merely temporary and partial). The fiscal procedure and the economic conditions became once more what they were before the fall of the Western Empire; to the advantage of the great landowners and the detriment of the rest of the population. The twenty years of the Gothic war had produced an indescribably state of desolation; famine and pestilence had decimated the population; more and more land had gone out of cultivation, while the small properties had disappeared altogether. Great cities like Milan and Rome had suffered terribly. It is said that Rome, after it was first captured by Totila, was for three months absolutely uninhabited.

During this period the last vestiges of municipal life disappeared, except in a very few cities like Ravenna and Naples. The municipal *curiae* were dissolved; in the end all trace of them was lost; and even the Roman Senate disappeared. It had been decimated by the Goths in the last period of the war. Now more than ever the most important person in the cities was the bishop, who was surrounded by the clergy of the cathedral church and the parishes. To the bishops were officially attributed by the Pragmatic Sanction various public functions of supervision and protection as regards the less capable elements of the population, and they also took part in the elections of the provincial governors. But their effective authority and intervention went far beyond the officially determined limits.

One thing that contributed very largely to the power of the bishops was the fact that they were among the largest landowners. In this

period the great agricultural estate attained its maximum importance. In this age of urban decadence the centres of economic life were the *villae* or *curtes* which formed the centres of the great estates. The "court" and the land surrounding it were exploited directly by the landlord, through his officials, the soil being tilled by slaves or by colonists who were obliged to furnish prestations of labour. The rest of the estate was cultivated by colonists, under varying conditions, but the common feature of these conditions was the cession by the colonists of some part of the yield of the cultivated soil to the lord, their adscription to the soil, and the dependence of their whole economic existence upon the "court." The "court" organized all the necessary services of life for those who lived on the estate: the grinding of corn, the baking of bread, the manufacture of tools and implements, furniture, and clothing. Blacksmiths, carpenters and tailors settled on holdings dependent on the "court," or at least worked for it, so that to a great extent it took the place of the city. This was the so-called domainal system; but this must not be understood as an exclusive system, enforced by law, for urban life never completely disappeared, nor did the professional classes in the cities become dependent in law on the great landowners. However, it may be presumed that the artisan corporations of the Roman period were almost everywhere disappearing. The military defence of the country was of great importance in the restoration of the imperial regime. It may be said that together with the fiscal system it constituted the chief preoccupation of the Byzantine government in Italy, and it very soon proved to be unequal to its task. The frontiers of Italy were restricted to the Alps, and indeed ran a little to the south of them. The frontier districts were defended by the *limitanei*, consisting partly of the army of manœuvre, and partly of the local militia; and the centres of defence were the *castra* or *castella* and the *clusurae*, to which *tribuni* were appointed; and above the tribunes were the *magistri militum*. These *limitanei* were paid by the state, and they also received grants of land, or obligatory prestations from the landowners. As regards the army of manœuvre, or central army, after the first years of the reconquest the Constantinople government did not keep it permanently in Italy, but sent troops from this region or that, where they were urgently required, as far

as the Barbarian invasions of the Balkan peninsula allowed, or the Persian threat to the eastern frontier.

The imperial reconquest reinforced the already close cultural bond between Italy and Byzantium. This was manifested mainly in two fields, the religious and the artistic. The relations—now friendly, now strained—between the Church of Rome and the Church of Constantinople were close and continuous. (The Roman pontiff maintained an *apocrisarius*, or nuncio, at the imperial court). Rome was full of Oriental monks, who had their own churches and monasteries. The cult of the Eastern saints, and Eastern rites and liturgies, became naturalized in the religious life of Italy. Under Justinian Byzantine art flourished greatly, and made its way into Italy. In this art the Roman traditions were largely modified by Oriental influences. On the basilical type of architecture (a rectangle, usually divided by columns into central and lateral naves, terminating in a semicircular apse, but afterwards furnished with transepts in the form of the Latin cross) was superimposed the type with a central dome and great vaulted roofs of complicated structure. In mosaic art, and the sister art of painting, hieratic rigidity and intensity of colour replaced the plastic robustness and the realistic representation of the human countenance which had characterized Roman art; a transformation not unrelated to the religiosity of the age, which was turning more and more to the life beyond the grave, seeking to forget in pious ecstasies the wretchedness of earthly existence.

It is not possible to draw a distinct line between the period of Roman art and that of the new art. We may say that in Rome, until the fifth century, Roman art was definitely predominant; not only in architecture (as in the basilica of Santa Maria Maggiore, rebuilt in the 5th century, and Santa Sabina, which was built then), but also in decoration. The splendid mosaic of Santa Pudenziana (c. 400) is still distinctly Roman in character, while the no less admirable mosaic of Saints Cosmas and Damian (526–530) has already certain Byzantine characteristics. In Ravenna the Oriental influence made itself felt much earlier, and more intensely, as may be seen in the mortuary chapel of Galla Placidia, the mother of Valentinian III (c. 440), which is a miracle of colour. The basilica of Sant'Apollinare Nuova was built

in Theodoric's time, but the two splendid ranks of saints on the longer walls are of the first Byzantine period. To the same period belongs the church of San Vitale, in plan a Greek cross with cupola, in whose apse are the famous mosaics of Justinian and Theodora with their respective retinues, in all their imperial pomp and splendour. A little later, but still of the sixth century, is the mosaic in the apse of Sant' Apollinare in Classe, near Ravenna; one of the noblest religious works of art of any age.

§ 21. THE SCHISM OF THE THREE CHAPTERS. BENEDICTINE MONASTICISM.—Notwithstanding the penetration into Italy of Byzantine piety and Byzantine religious art, it was in the field of religion that a sudden difference arose between Italy and Constantinople. The so-called Byzantine "Caesaropapism" began to clash with the traditions of independence in respect of the civil power and of ecclesiastical primacy which had early taken root in the Roman pontificate. There were profound differences, moreover, in the religious thought and feeling of the two capitals: in the East, theological speculation and mystical introspection were prevalent; in the West, moral discipline and the close connection between religion and the life of society. This religious and ecclesiastical opposition encouraged, or even inspired, the Italian spirit of independence as against subservience to the Byzantine empire.

No longer protected as in the time of the Goths by a power foreign to the imperial aspirations of dominion over the Church, the Bishop of Rome soon felt the consequences of the change. The Empress Theodora, who played a leading part in the political and ecclesiastical affairs of the empire, and supported the Monophysites, finding that Pope Silverius did not comply with her orders, had him arrested by Belisarius as guilty of high treason, deposed, and sent into exile. In his place the deacon Vigilius was enthroned (537–555), who had pledged himself to the empress when *apocrisarius* in Constantinople. As pontiff, however, Vigilius also resisted the imperial will, and came into conflict with Justinian himself. The latter, though he was not, like his wife, a Monophysite, had nevertheless been persuaded to make an attempt to reconcile the moderate Monophysites with the imperial Church;

and with this object he issued an edict condemning as guilty of Nestorianism—that is, of the heresy opposed to Monophysitism—three ecclesiastical personages of the 5th century (the bishops Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, and Iba of Edessa), whom the Council of Chalcedon had failed to condemn or had actually rehabilitated. The edict, known as the *Edict of the Three Chapters*, was regarded by the more ardent partisans of the Council of Chalcedon—that is, the Westerners, and more especially the Italians, who found that the formulae of Chalcedon satisfied their need of perceiving in Christ a moral human nature—as a blow struck at the Council. Pope Vigilius, however, refused to condemn the Three Chapters, and was sent to Constantinople. There, some time later, he consented to publish the condemnation (548), but the churches of the West rebelled against his verdict. He then withdrew his declaration, and for some time was involved in a bitter dispute with the empress, who did not shrink from subjecting him to violence. The Italian Church endeavoured to support him, appealing for Frankish intervention. A Council (553) convoked by the emperor in Constantinople (the Fifth Oecumenical Council), which consisted almost entirely of Eastern bishops, pronounced the condemnation of the Three Chapters and broke off relations with the Pope, who persisted in his opposition. Finally Vigilius agreed to the condemnation (553–554) and was sent back to Italy; but he died on the way home, in Sicily (555).

His successor, Pelagius I (556–561), who, like Vigilius, had been nuncio in Constantinople, was appointed by Justinian. The Popes who followed him, though they were not, like Pelagius, appointed by the emperor, had to wait, before they could be consecrated, for the approval of the emperor or the exarch of Ravenna, so that the Roman Church was subject to imperial control. Pelagius, however, notwithstanding the support of the Empire, had great difficulty in getting himself acknowledged in Rome itself, for having adhered to the condemnation of the Three Chapters he was suspected of anti-Chalcedonianism. He succeeded, nevertheless, in overcoming the opposition in his metropolitan sphere, but in the circumscriptions of Milan and Aquileia—that is, throughout Northern Italy—he was not acknowledged as pontiff.

This was the schism of the Three Chapters, which divided religious Italy into two hostile camps. Relations between Rome and Milan were re-established under the immediate successor to Pelagius, John III (561-574), though resistance still persisted in the metropolitan sphere of Milan; in the territory of Aquileia (that is, Venetia and Istria), whose bishop now assumed the title of patriarch, the schismatics long remained obdurate. At the close of the century Gregory the Great was able to secure a partial return to communion with Rome; and a few years after his death the Exarch of Ravenna succeeded in procuring the election at Grado of a non-schismatic Patriarch of Aquileia. On the mainland, however, another patriarch was nominated, and there were thenceforth two Patriarchs of Aquileia.

In the critical state to which political vicissitudes had brought the Italian Church a new institution arose unconnected with the official organization, which infused the religious life with fresh vitality, and which was destined to become of great social importance: namely, Benedictine monasticism. It was one of the most vigorous affirmations of Western Romano-Barbaric autonomy in respect of the Byzantine Orient.

As early as the 4th century the monasticism of the East had found admirers and imitators in the West. Many monasteries had arisen in the course of the 5th century (some of the more famous in Provence), which had made some attempt to adapt the monastic life of the East to Occidental needs. But the creation of an Occidental monasticism with a character of its own, and comparable in importance to that of the Orient, was not achieved until the first half of the 6th century, when it was the work of an Italian monk, Benedict of Norcia (born probably between 480 and 490; died after 546). A member of an Umbrian family of the lesser nobility, he had studied awhile in Rome, but he soon abandoned his studies in order to seek salvation in a life of retirement. For some time he lived as a hermit near Subiaco; then, already famed for his sanctity, he became the head of various monasteries (twelve, according to tradition) which he himself had founded. A conflict with some member of the secular clergy is said to have induced him to leave the district. At all events, having removed to Campania, he there founded, on the heights overlooking Cassino, a

great monastery (there is no evidence to support the traditional date of 529), which was destined to become one of the chief centres of monastic life throughout the Middle Ages. However, the foundation of Monte Cassino had but a short life for the time being, since it was destroyed by the Longobards about ten years after the saint's death, and was not restored until the 8th century. But the influence of St. Benedict made itself felt everywhere through the medium of his Rule.

The Rule, written in a Latin which is not scholarly, but robust and pithy, has many affinities with earlier rules, both Occidental and Oriental; but it is inspired throughout by an original spirit. It does not aim at the creation of extraordinary ascetics, who would attain to perfection in a life of isolation; it is a discipline of life attainable in great communities, and therefore by very ordinary individuals. Its fundamental characteristics are therefore sociability and moderation. No excessive austerities are required of the monks in respect of food and clothing and sleep. As compared with what must have been the life of a colonist or other person of humble condition in those days, the regime of Monte Cassino may be called fairly comfortable. The sanctification of the monks is procured by constant occupation—but even this is wisely regulated—prayer in common at the canonical hours (matins, tierce, etc.), intellectual work, and manual labour. This latter, in addition to whatever was required for the needs of the monastery and the monks, had to include the actual cultivation of the soil in the neighbourhood if there were not labourers enough available. The foundation of Monte Cassino itself involved building operations and agricultural reclamation of an exemplary nature. The head of the community was the abbot, elected by the community itself. His power was absolute, but according to the prescriptions of the Rule he must exercise it with moderation and charity, listening to the opinions of the brothers in all matters of importance.

St. Benedict did not found a religious Order; his Rule was for the monks of Monte Cassino, and it presupposed the complete autonomy of each community. However, from the 6th century onwards it became generally diffused, above all in Italy and France, and it served as a model, as its author had undoubtedly foreseen. A foundation contemporary with the Benedictine was that of *Vivarium* in Calabria,



the achievement of the Gothic ex-minister Cassiodorus, who retired from public life about 540. A particular feature of *Vivarium* was the systematic application of the monks to various studies (and among other things to the collection and transcription of manuscripts), which was not contemplated in the Benedictine Rule. For his own monks, Cassiodorus edited his own writings of his second period. The example of *Vivarium* may have influenced the first Benedictine monasteries in this respect; on the whole, however, it was the monasticism of Cassiodorus that underwent absorption into the Benedictine monasticism. Further, at the beginning of the 7th century, the monastery of Bobbio was founded (between 612 and 614) to the south-west of Piacenza, by the efforts of an Irish monk, St. Columban, who had come to Italy from France. Bobbio was still flourishing exceedingly when Monte Cassino lay in ruins; but the Rule of Columban, with its excessive austerity, involving corporal castigations which were almost unknown to the Benedictines, was very soon replaced by the milder Rule, both at Bobbio and in the Columban monasteries in France. Benedictine monasticism was introduced into England by the missionaries who were sent thither about 600 to convert the Angles and Saxons. Thus throughout Western Europe a monasticism was gradually diffused which was of a type especially adapted to the society of the period. The Benedictine monasteries became centres of economic life, and with their colonists, better treated and more settled and securer than others, it helped to revive the economy of the time. It should be noted, however, that Benedictine monasticism came to be stronger and more autonomous outside Italy than in the land of its birth. In Italy, for a long time to come, the small urban or suburban monasteries predominated, which were more subject to the bishops, and were dedicated almost wholly to the sacred liturgy.

## CHAPTER IV

### BYZANTINE AND LOMBARD ITALY

§ 22. THE LOMBARD INVASION AND THE DIVISION OF ITALY.—The Empire of the East, by its armed intervention, had destroyed the defence which the Goths had built up against further invasions of Italy, and had prevented the construction of a new state of the Frankish or Visigothic type. It will soon be evident that it was incapable of following this negative achievement by a positive labour of defence and reconstruction.

Justin II (565–578), following his maternal uncle, Justinian I—the succession to the imperial throne was decided by election by the army and the senate, but normally the kinsmen of the defunct emperor were preferred—recalled Narses from the government of Italy; it was rumoured, because the Italians complained that his fiscal system was oppressive. His recall was almost immediately followed by the Lombard invasion; and it was said that this was undertaken at the instigation of the fallen official. The Lombards knew something of Italy, for a body of Lombard troops had taken part—under the command of Narses himself—in the expedition against Totila.

The Lombards or Longobardi—so-called from the long beards, which together with the long hair hanging over their shoulders characterized their appearance—were a Germanic population which had settled on the middle Danube in the second half of the second century. When the Rugii were defeated by Odoacer, the Lombards occupied their territory on the further side of the Danube, but almost immediately afterwards they moved into the *Campi patentis*, the plains between the Danube and the Theiss, and on the fall of the Herulian kingdom (c. 510) they crossed the Theiss. In the days of Totila they became allies of the Empire, and by arrangement with the latter their king Alboin destroyed the Gepidae. They then found themselves hard pressed by a Uralo-Altaic people, the Avars. To them

they surrendered Pannonia, moving upon Italy in conjunction with groups of other Barbarian peoples, including a strong nucleus of Saxons.

Alboin entered Italy without difficulty in the spring of 568, descending from Upper Friuli. A good part of the population of Venetia fled before the invaders, seeking safety more especially in the lagoons; thus the Patriarch of Aquileia took refuge at Grado. The Bishop of Treviso came to terms with the conqueror, who undertook to respect ecclesiastical property. Having taken Vicenza and Verona—Padua for the time being remained an imperial city—and meeting with resistance in Mantua, defended by its marshes, Alboin advanced upon Milan, which was occupied in September 569. Pavia held out for three years, and shortly after its fall Alboin was the victim of a palace conspiracy (572). The Lombard Assembly foregathered in Pavia elected Cleph as the new king. Under him the Lombards continued their career of conquest. When Cleph was murdered by a slave (574) no successor was elected, and the dukes among whom the conquered territory was distributed made themselves independent, each in his own duchy. The Lombard conquerors, having occupied almost the whole of the Padanian plain, drove a wedge into the Byzantine territory, advancing in the direction of Calabria, so that on the margins of the conquered area there were many territories that were still subject to the Empire, and in general the Lombard occupation was lacking in compactness. At first the Lombards were to a great extent cut off from the coast; nor did they possess a fleet. Unlike the Gothic invasion, the Lombard occupation was not undertaken in the emperor's name, but was effected in a war against the Empire. Here was an essential difference, and for Italy the Middle Ages might be said to begin at this point. Yet the difference was not so great as may appear at first sight. The Ostrogoths had found the limit of their power over Italy in the continuance of the juridical bond with the Empire; the Lombards found it in their incomplete territorial occupation. In the place of the internal dualism of the Romano-Gothic regime we see an external Byzantine-Lombard dualism, which was reflected in the internal conditions of that part of Italy which had been subjected by the new invaders. The political and territorial integrity of Italy was shattered for the first time since

the days of the Roman Republic, nor was it restored until the breach of Porta Pia. Part of Italy was still a province of the Empire, while in the other part the formation of a Romano-Barbarian kingdom of the Transalpine type was, if not wholly prevented, yet delayed and opposed by the presence, on the frontiers, of the Empire, demanding its rights, and by the consciousness of the Romano-Italian population of the conquered territory—a consciousness which persisted, at all events, for some considerable time—that they still, in law, belonged to the Empire. The Roman population, in fact, owing to the manner in which the conquest had been effected, had found themselves, as regards the Lombards, in the position of a conquered people at the mercy of the conquerors; and the harshness with which they were treated in the early days of the conquest was the result of their unprotected state. A few great landowners were murdered and their estates completely confiscated by the Lombards; the rest, as far as we can judge from the scanty records, were divided between the conquerors as tributary subjects, who had to pay a third part of the produce of their estate, and were deprived of personal liberty.

The Constantinople government, incapable, owing to the state of affairs in the East, of sending to Italy the forces which would have been required for its reconquest, but not unmoved by the Italian appeals for help, conceived the notion of employing the Franks to fight the Lombards. After the death of Clovis the Merovingian state had been divided among his sons, according to the rules of patrimonial division: dissected into various kingdoms with unsettled frontiers, some of them partly or entirely enclosed within another kingdom. The principal divisions were Austrasia or Eastern Francia (comprising also the Germanic territories), Neustria or Western Francia, corresponding very largely with the Northern France of to-day, and Burgundia, or the kingdom of Arles, which included Provence. Notwithstanding these divisions, and the conflicts between the various Frankish kingdoms, these latter constituted a very considerable power as against that of the Lombards. After a series of Lombard incursions into Burgundy, which were raids undertaken for the sake of booty rather than invasions, the Franks reacted, seizing the outlet from the valleys of the Western Alps (Susa, Aosta); so that the frontiers of Italy were beginning to

be infringed. Childebert II, King of Austrasia, an ally of the Byzantines, descended upon Northern Italy in great strength (584), while the Byzantines took the offensive on the middle of the Po. But Lombard money persuaded the Frankish king to abandon his expedition.

The Lombard leaders, realizing the gravity of the danger and the necessity of a unitary command, restored the monarchy, electing as their king Authari (584-590), the son of Cleph. The king was provided with a territorial patrimony by the cession, by the various dukes, of half the land in their possession. The restoration of the monarchy was accompanied by a beginning of internal systematization, even in the relations between the Lombards and the Romans, resulting in better conditions and greater security of life. In particular, some of the confiscated estates were restored to the Church. The surname of Flavius, assumed by Authari, and retained by his successors, was a sign of a new policy, since it meant that the Lombard kings regarded themselves as the successors to and continuators of the Empire in Italy.

This more moderate policy toward the subject Romans did not result in an immediate improvement of relations with the Empire, which once more incited Childebert to intervene in Italy. Authari, however, opposed him successfully, and was also victorious over the imperial forces. Tradition tells of his triumphant advance as far as Reggio Calabria. He married a Catholic princess, Theodolinda, the daughter of the Duke of Bavaria, who was able to preserve the balance of power as between the Longobards and Austrasia. Left a widow, Theodolinda married Authari's successor, Agilulf (590-616), who continued the policy of his predecessor. At home he consolidated the royal power, subduing certain rebellious duchies; and abroad he was able to conclude a peace with the Franks of Austrasia, which lasted for some time, despite the confusion and the reciprocal conflicts of the Frankish kingdoms. Against Italy Agilulf resumed hostilities with greater energy than his predecessor, and even blockaded Rome itself. Pope Gregory I, known as Gregory the Great (590-609), concluded a truce with him, agreeing to pay tribute; and later on he succeeded in persuading the Lombard to conclude another truce with the Empire (598-601). This latter truce having expired, Agilulf resumed his wars of conquest, liquidating the Byzantine positions which were still

holding out in Padanian Italy by the occupation of Cremona, Mantua and Padua. Then followed another series of peaces and truces. With these a state of equilibrium was attained in respect of the Empire, although for three-quarters of a century there were many resumptions of the conflict: but henceforth the Empire realized that it was not capable of reconquering the lost territory, while the Lombard kingdom did not carry its policy of conquest to its extreme conclusion, though it made some additions to its territory from time to time.

The intermittent nature of the Lombard conquests from the beginning of the 7th century may have been due in part to the progressive conversion of the Lombards to Catholicism; for when this conversion was complete there were no more wars of conquest for several decades. This conversion began under Agilulf; and Gregory the Great, who got into touch with Theodelinda, his wife, profited considerably from the improved relations between the Catholic clergy and the Lombards. Adaloald, the son of Agilulf and Theodelinda, was baptized according to the Catholic rite (603). Although Agilulf was not converted, he did not oppose the conversion of others, and the churches and bishops benefited by his measures of reparation.

On the death of Agilulf a Catholic ascended the throne in the person of his son Adaloald (615–626), who during his reign was at peace with the Empire. But the Lombard conversion to Catholicism was as yet somewhat incomplete; so that there were internal conflicts between an Arian and a Catholic movement. Adaloald was deprived of the crown by the Arians, who replaced him by Arioald (626–636), the husband of a daughter of Theodelinda and Agilulf. Arioald's widow, Gundeburga, married Rothari (636–652), Duke of Brescia, another Arian, who utterly defeated the exarch Isaac on the Panaro, and extended the Lombard rule to Genoa and the two Riviere. The accession of Aripert (653–661), the grandson of a brother of Theodelinda, was the beginning of a Bavaro-Catholic dynasty, which was interrupted by the reign of Grimoald, Duke of Benevento (662–671), of whom we cannot say with certainty whether he was Catholic or Arian. Grimoald had to withstand a new—and final—Byzantine attempt at reconquest, made by the Emperor Constans II in person. Departing from the tactics hitherto followed by the exarchs, he moved

to the attack from the south, laying siege to Benevento; but he was completely defeated, and had to abandon his venture (663). And now the Greeks lost even the Salentine peninsula. On the death of Grimoald the dynasty of Aripert was continued by his son Pertarius, and his son, Cunimpert. The two reigns (671–700) saw the complete conversion of the Lombards to Catholicism, the end of the schism of Aquileia—the work of a synod convoked by Cunimpert at Pavia—and peace between the Lombard kingdom and the Empire on the basis of the *status quo* (c. 680).

§ 23. CONDITIONS IN LOMBARD AND BYZANTINE ITALY. THE ROMAN CHURCH.—The head of the Lombard state was the king, elected by the assembly of freemen, which identified itself with the army. The principle of dynastic continuity was a potent influence in the elections. The king exercised supreme authority in the administrative, judicial and military spheres; he promulgated the laws (edicts), convoked the army with the *heriban*, and made war and peace. The assembly assisted him in establishing the laws and in taking decisions of prime importance. He exercised a special guardianship (*mundium*) over widows, orphans, foreigners, and in general over all those who would otherwise be unprotected. To governmental posts he appointed high court dignitaries (marshal, majordomo, referendarius or chancellor), chosen for the most part from the class of *gasindi*, or persons employed in the particular and personal service of the king.

The division of the country into provinces, which had disappeared under Lombard rule, was replaced by the division into duchies, which in most cases were based on the administrative circumscription of the cities with their appertaining territories (so that the cities had not disappeared). Some of the frontier duchies, however, covered whole provinces. Such were the duchies of Friuli and Trent, and above all those of Spoleto and Benevento. The duke was a royal functionary, appointed by the king, normally for life, but his institution was revocable in the event of serious delinquencies; but by virtue of his ties with the local Lombard population, and his ample territorial domains, he enjoyed in actual fact a very great degree of autonomy,

and in many cases the right of hereditary succession. This weakness of the royal as against the ducal power, with the frequent rebellions of the dukes, and their alliances among themselves or with foreign powers, were the principal cause of the fall of the Lombard kingdom. The duchies of Spoleto and Benevento in particular, partly on account of their geographical remoteness, were almost like two confederate or vassal states, which were sometimes hostile to the king.

Nevertheless, even within the local circumscriptions the king was not without means of exercising direct action. This power he owed to the territorial domains of the crown, administered by royal functionaries known as *gastaldi*, with powers analogous to those of the dukes, but much more dependent upon the king. Their appointment was temporary and revocable at will. In the course of time the institution of the *gastaldato* was extended to the royal domains in cities conquered by the king, or domains which had been vacated for other reasons, and had come directly under his governance. On the other hand, these territorial domains of the crown were generously given in usufruct to the royal officials themselves, to churches, and to monasteries, and the royal patrimony was correspondingly diminished.

The social constitution of the Lombards distinguished between the freemen, the semi-free or *aldii*, and slaves. In the beginning the freemen were all landowners, and at the same time soldiers, whence their name of *arimanni* (men of the army) or *exercitales*. In the course of time, as a result of the natural vicissitudes of fortune, there were a number of freemen without land, from whose ranks, in particular, were recruited the *gasindi* (who then, thanks to concessions of crown lands, could once more become landowners). The *aldii* enjoyed personal liberty, but were under the *mundium* or tutelage of the landowner whose land they cultivated, and which they could not abandon; so that their condition was analogous to that of the Roman colonists. Among the slaves there were many grades and distinctions: the "ministerial" slaves who superintended the management of the patronal household and the estates under direct cultivation by the landowner, the "stewards," who cultivated the property, the swineherds, who tended the herds of swine (great numbers of which were reared by the Lombards), and the ordinary agricultural slaves. On



the whole, the territorial system of the Lombards did not fundamentally differ from that of the Romans. Those Romans who had retained possession of their estates must have occupied the status of *aldii*, since they had to pay tribute. At the same time there may have been Romans—especially when some little time had elapsed after the Lombard invasion—who were regarded as freemen, as being included in the category of *vargangi* or foreigners under the protection of the crown. It is also possible that the indigenous population was allowed to settle its own affairs in accordance with the Roman law. All these various categories will be found in the first codification of Lombard law, the edict of Rothari (643), issued by the king “and his principal judges”—that is, the dukes and *gastaldi*. The edict is in Latin, but it corresponds almost completely with the Lombard Institutes. The principle of *guidrigildo* (*Wehrgeld*, literally “defence money”) is particularly prominent: that is, the payment of monetary compensation by whomsoever has killed or wounded another person, the amount varying in accordance with the category of the latter.

Byzantine Italy was still divided into a great many fragments, feebly united, or not united at all (except by sea), some of which were like islands in the Lombard ocean. These various divisions, counting from the extreme north, were as follows:

(1) Venetia, reduced to the coasts and the islands of the Venetian lagoon, and Istria;

(2) The Exarchate, comprising Emilia, excluding the portion to the south of Modena, with Ravenna, the residence of the Exarch;

(3) Pentapolis, immediately adjoining the latter, between the Marecchia and the Esino, divided into maritime Pentapolis (Rimini, Pesaro, Fano, Sinigaglia, Ancona) and annony Pentapolis (the internal portion, reaching across the Apennines, comprising Urbino, Fossombrone, Iesi, Cagli, Gubbio). A line of fortresses (Perugia, Amelia, Otricoli) joined Pentapolis to

(4) The Roman Duchy, comprising Tuscya on the north of the Tiber and Campania (whence “Campagna”) on the south, as far as Terracina;

(5) The Duchy of Naples, divided into three several parts; one, with Gaeta, adjacent to the Roman Campania; the main nucleus,

with Naples, isolated, from Cumae to Amalfi, and a third region, also isolated, to the south of the Sele, with Pesto (Paestum) and Agropoli;

(6) Calabria, or Terra d'Otranto, reduced by the end of the 7th century to the extreme edge of the Salentine peninsula, with Lecce, Otranto and Gallipoli, and afterwards joined to Bruzio (Bruttii, Bruttium);

(7) Bruzio, which afterwards took the name of Calabria. The islands, as we have seen, did not form part of the Italian circumscription.

The name *Romania* was commonly applied to Byzantine Italy (to distinguish it from *Longobardia*), whence Romagna, this name being applied particularly to the Exarchate.

This division and disarticulation of Byzantine Italy favoured the development of local and autonomous life, which was further assisted by profound transformations in the political and social constitution. The lack of a central army of manœuvre and the extension of the system of frontier defence by territorial militia (§ 20) to practically the whole of Byzantine Italy—allowing for the intersection of the latter by Longobard Italy—led to the predominance of the local military element. This was identical with the landowning element; the owners of estates furnished the men for their defence and commanded them; and it also happened that soldiers transferred to a defensive position were granted land there. The tribunes in command of the castles and the nuclei of local militia were therefore for the most part natives, and the proportion of natives was even greater among their subordinate officers. Thus the territorial aristocracy became a military organization, and citizen forces were created (army of Ravenna, Roman army). To a very great extent the effective power passed into their hands, and a consequence of this was the enfeeblement of the imperial power. On many occasions these local forces intervened against the imperial power, and in Ravenna, at the beginning of the 2nd century, there was an organized rebellion which continued for about a year.

In Rome the political power was becoming concentrated in the hands of the pontiff—assisted by a staff of lay and ecclesiastical

functionaries—who enjoyed a dominating position by virtue of his ecclesiastical primacy and his religious prestige as the successor to the Apostles Peter and Paul. The ever more numerous pilgrimages to the tombs of the Apostles, and the devotion to St. Peter so general among the Western peoples, helped to increase this prestige of the Roman pontiff, and to maintain the world-wide importance of Rome. However, the union of ecclesiastical and civil power in the hands of the bishop was not a phenomenon peculiar to Rome; in Ravenna also the archbishop held a position of great political importance, which his great territorial wealth did much to support. In Naples, however, a wealthy and cultured city, an urban development was evolving which led to the transformation of the Byzantine duke into a local magistrate, and the temporary association of the ducal with the episcopal authority.

A peculiar but singularly fortunate instance of this development of local life under the supreme authority of the Empire was that of Venice. The name of the region had become restricted to the narrow littoral belt, together with the lagoons, which had not been occupied by the Lombards. The people of the mainland had begun to take refuge on the islands of the lagoon in the time of the Barbarian invasions. They did so in the days of Attila, and afterwards during the Gothic wars, the Frankish incursions, and the Lombard occupation. From Aquileia, Concordia, Altino and Padua the inhabitants migrated to Grado, Caorle, Torcello, Malamocco. The transference of the archiepiscopal see from Aquileia to Grado gave the lagoons a religious leader. Safe from the invasions, the inhabitants exploited the natural resources of their new home, trading their fish and salt, and in this way they maintained relations with the mainland, where they still possessed some territory on the coast. Here too local militias were formed, with their tribunes; castles were built, and before long there was a military and territorial aristocracy to compete with the commercial aristocracy.

In the development of Italian autonomy as opposed to Byzantium, the papal and episcopal authority was important not only in the political and economic field, but also in the purely ecclesiastical sphere. The accession of Gregory the Great to the pontificate (590–604)

was an event of historical importance. He exercised a minute and imperious control over his Italian episcopates, especially over those within his metropolitan sphere, watching over their administration, enforcing discipline, and seeking at the same time to repair the ruin and disorder caused by the Lombard invasion and the subsequent state of war. He gave much attention to the administration of the patrimonies of the Roman Church, which were scattered over different parts of Italy, and he employed their rectors as his representatives in all ecclesiastical and civil affairs. With the income from these patrimonies he did much to succour the wants of the people, especially in Rome, where he assumed (as in liberating Rome from its investment by Agilulf) the functions of an actual ruler. He was repeatedly in conflict with the Exarch of Ravenna, and sometimes even with the emperor, to whom, however, he always showed the greatest respect and obedience. A direct conflict with Constantinople was occasioned by the assumption by the Patriarch of Constantinople of the title of *Oecumenicus* (universal), which Gregory opposed as an usurpation of the power of the other bishops. Gregory maintained relations also with the churches and sovereigns of Spain, France and England. In Spain and France, however, neither he nor his immediate successor exercised any real powers of governance. It was otherwise in England, to which country Gregory sent a band of monks to convert the Anglo-Saxons, thus directly promoting the foundation of the English Church, which remained in close touch with Rome. Gregory further enhanced the prestige of the pontificate by his activity in every department of ecclesiastical life; and notably by his reform of the Roman liturgy and his furtherance of sacred music (the Gregorian chant). Above all, he lived for posterity in his writings—especially the “Dialogues,” in which he related miraculous events that had occurred in Italy in recent times, and which were extremely popular throughout the Middle Ages. In addition to the *Dialogi* we may mention the *Regula pastores*, the manual of the complete bishop, in which ascetic piety is blended with a clear perception of the practical activity required of the heads of the Church; and the *Moralia*, a full allegorical and moral commentary on the Book of Job. Gregory’s literary works were of signal importance in the development of the

Latin tongue, which was undergoing progressive modification by vulgar forms.

The conflicts between the Roman Church and the Empire in the course of the 7th century were much more serious than those which had occurred under Gregory the Great. The Emperor Heraclius, still aiming at an understanding with the Monophysites, issued an edict (*Ecthesis*, 638) affirming the existence of a single will in Jesus Christ: that is, the absorption of the human will by the divine. This doctrine of Monothelism, which was not unfavourably received by Pope Honorius I (625–638), had been definitely rejected by his successors, particularly by Martin I, who refused even to accept the “Type” of Constans II, in which the emperor forbade the discussion of the question, and he caused the two imperial documents to be condemned by a great Council in the Lateran (649). On political pretexts Pope Martin was arrested, taken to Constantinople, and sent into exile, where he died. Constans II, in order to weaken the Roman pontificate, proclaimed the independence (*autocefalia*) of the Archbishopric of Ravenna. But the new emperor Constantine IV (668–685), known as *Pogenatus* (the bearded), abandoned the ecclesiastical policy of his father. The sixth Oecumenical Council of Constantinople (680–681) proclaimed the doctrine of the two wills in Christ, in accordance with Pope Agathon, though it associated with this proclamation a condemnation of Pope Honorius; and the emperor revoked the decree of *autocefalia* which had declared Ravenna independent of Rome. With Justinian II, the successor of Pogonatus, the disputes were revived; the emperor convoked (692) a new Council in Constantinople (known as *Trullan*, from the Trullo, the hall of the royal palace in which it assembled), whose disciplinary decrees did not meet with approval in Rome. Justinian II then made arrangements for the arrest of Pope Sergius I, but the troops of Ravenna and Pentapolis rebelled against the imperial representative, banding together in support of the pontiff.

§ 24. THE TEMPORAL POWER AND THE END OF BYZANTINE AND LOMBARD RULE.—We see, then, that in the beginning of the 8th century four factors were interacting in the public life of Italy:

the Lombard kingdom, the Empire, the Papacy, and local autonomy. The first two, so far as they were able to live at peace, were mutually exclusive, while they both came into conflict with the fourth; and between the three of them the Papacy manœuvred, tending more and more to become an autonomous territorial power. It was necessarily most hostile to the Lombard kingdom; it was in full agreement with the autonomous tendencies in so far as it was able to profit by them; but it was necessarily hostile to them where they tended to combine and transform themselves into an Italian empire. Against Byzantium it fought in so far as the latter interfered in ecclesiastical affairs and obstructed the development of episcopal supremacy; but it was in favour of the maintenance of a formal supremacy of the Empire which would hinder the formation of more dangerous sovereign states.

When Leo III (Isauricus, 717-741), the head of a new Byzantine dynasty, applied himself to the reorganization of the Empire, seeking to include Italy, he was opposed by a temporary coalition of the other three political factors. His attempted reorganization of the system of imposts in Italy aroused the resistance of Pope Gregory II (715-731), who in opposing the Exarch was supported not only by the Roman forces, but also by the duchies of Spoleto and Benevento. What has been called the "Italian Revolution" assumed its full development when the emperor sought to impose his religious reform, which opposed the cult of social images (Iconoclasy). This reform, which excited the most serious opposition in the East, although there it had its supporters, found none but opponents in Italy. The religious sentiment of the Italian people was blended with hostility to Byzantine rule and devout respect for the pontifical decisions. Gregory II condemned the iconoclastic edict (issued in 725 or 726), requested the Italians to disobey it, and incited the Roman troops to resist it. The imperial Duke of Rome was divested of his office; similar action was taken by the local militia in Pentapolis and Venetia, and in the latter region there was appointed, for the first time, a communal leader or Doge independent of the Byzantine Duke of Istria. In Ravenna the Exarch Paul lost his life in the rebellion. The Lombard king, Luitprand (712-744)—whose reign marked a period of con-

solidation and splendour in the Lombard state—intervened on the side of the religious revolt, seizing the occasion to revive the programme of Italian unification under the Lombard sceptre. Marching into Pentapolis and the Exarchate, he advanced almost to the walls of Rome. Gregory II opposed him, calling upon the people to remain loyal to the Empire even while they repudiated iconoclasy. He induced Luitprand to call a halt and restore Sutri, which he had occupied, to the Roman Church and the imperial functionaries. In opposing the king the Pope relied on the support of the Duchies of Spoleto and Benevento, which, as usual, had rebelled against the royal power. Luitprand then changed his policy, allying himself with the new Byzantine exarch Eutychus rather than with the Italians and the Papacy; and the two of them laid siege to Rome. Luitprand succeeded in subduing the rebellious duchies, and the Exarch restored the Byzantine authority in Rome, Ravenna, and Venetia (although here the local ruler continued in power under Byzantine suzerainty). An anti-imperial rising in Tuscia was liquidated with the assistance of Roman troops.

The new Pope, Gregory III (731–741), continued the struggle on two fronts, fighting against the Empire for ecclesiastical independence and against the Lombard kingdom for political independence. The upshot of his conflict with the Empire was that he had to submit to the sequestration of the Roman patrimonies in Southern Italy, while this region—that is, as much of it as was still subject to the Empire—was withdrawn from his ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and Illyria was reunited to the patriarchate of Constantinople. Luitprand advanced still further into the Roman duchy, but once more halted; whether from religious scruples or because he had no definite political programme we do not know. For a time he made himself master of Ravenna, but the Exarch expelled him with the help of the Venetian fleet, to obtain which he appealed to the good offices of the pontiff. The conflicting nature of the various political factors prevented the emergence of any attempt at reorganizing a united Italy. The situation remained unchanged even under Pope Zacharias (741–752), who succeeded in concluding a twenty years' truce with Luitprand on behalf of the Duchy of Rome—agreeing in return to give no assistance

to the rebel duchies of Spoleto and Benevento—and induced the king to conclude a truce also with the Exarch. The favourable moment did not return; Luitprand died in 744 without having achieved the unification of Italy.

The constitution of a temporal sovereignty now became a matter of capital importance for the Papacy. For more than three hundred years, until the reform of the 11th century, the aspect of the pontiff as temporal prince was predominant. Henceforth Byzantium no longer appeared a formidable enemy to the Papacy; the two sources of danger were the movement towards Italian autonomy, which might transform itself into an Italian empire, and the Lombard kingdom, whose aim was the subjection of all Italy. The possibility of a fusion between the two was not excluded. The Papacy, with a just political intuition that as far as its temporal power was concerned it would be better to replace an Italian kingdom, rooted in the peninsula, by a power whose seat was external to it, turned to the Franks as enemies of the Lombards. Gregory III had already made a vain effort to reach agreement with Charles Martel, the omnipotent mayor of the palace of the last Merovingian kings. Now a fresh set of circumstances led to an alliance between the Papacy and the successors of Charles Martel—that is, the new Carolingian dynasty.

The two sons of Charles Martel, Carloman and Pippin the Short, entered into relations with the Roman Church in connection with the work of evangelization and organization in Germany, and the reformation of the Frankish Church, accomplished by their Archbishop Boniface, who was devoted to the Roman Church. When Pippin the Short, as the sole Frankish ruler, decided upon a formal assumption of the royal authority, he wished to sanction the change of dynasty by asking the approval of Pope Zacharias (751), who did not withhold it, and he was anointed king by Archbishop Boniface.

The Frankish-Papal alliance, which the Pope encouraged by appealing to the devotion of the Franks for St. Peter, came just in time to deal with the new Lombard insurrection. In 751 King Aistulf, the third successor from Luitprand, finally occupied the Exarchate and entered Ravenna. He now considered himself the heir to the imperial authority in Italy, and sought to exercise his sovereignty



even over Rome. The Roman Duchy was in actual fact independent, and its most authoritative magistrate, beside and above the Duke, who was locally elected, was the pontiff. Stephen II (752-757) betook himself to Francia, where he met Pippin, and obtained his promise (*Promissio Carisiaca*, because given at Quierzy) to protect the Roman Church and the Roman people and to force the Lombard king to restore to the see of St. Peter the rights which he had usurped and the territory which he had occupied. In return the Pope anointed Pippin and his two sons King of the Franks and "patricians of the Romans" (754). In conferring this latter dignity the Pope assumed the powers of the emperor, and at the same time he conferred upon the King of the Franks an undefined authority in Rome. Pippin, for his part, treated the pontiff as territorial head of the Roman Duchy, the Exarchate, and Pentapolis, without considering how these possessions were related to the Empire. The temporal power of the Popes was established.

In two expeditions Pippin defeated Aistulf, besieged him in Pavia, and exacted a promise that he would at once begin the delivery of the cities of the Exarchate and Pentapolis to the pontiff (756). Aistulf having died soon afterwards, his successor Desiderius, Duke of Tuscia, came into conflict with Pope Paul I (757-767) in respect of the restitutions which had still to be completed. The pontiff had to contend with yet other rivals for his temporal power; in the Exarchate the Archbishop of Ravenna aspired to become Duke-Bishop, and in the Roman duchy the lay aristocracy were trying to gain the upper hand.

It was in this conjuncture, probably, in the time of Paul I, that the famous "Donation of Constantine" (*Constitutum Constantini*) was fabricated by Roman clerks. That it was a forgery was recognized centuries ago. It was based on a legend of some antiquity, according to which Constantine was cured of leprosy by Pope Sylvester, and afterwards baptized by him. By way of returning thanks for his baptism, Constantine, according to the "Donation," surrendered to Pope Sylvester power and jurisdiction over Rome and over all the provinces of Italy and the West, removing his own seat to Byzantium, as it was not convenient that the mundane emperor should exercise his power where Christ, the Celestial Emperor, had established the head

of the Christian religion. The apocryphal document was a sort of politico-religious manifesto intended to justify the temporal power of the pontiff (and also its subsequent extension), the close relations between the Papacy and the Frankish kingdom, and its independence of the imperial authority.

On the death of Paul I a series of very grave disturbances occurred in Rome, in which all the lay and clerical factions of the city were involved, and also the Lombards of Spoleto, who were now more independent than ever. Two Popes were created and then deposed by irregular methods, until order was restored by the election of Stephen III (768–772). During his pontificate Desiderius entered into friendly relations with the Frankish kingdom, where Pippin had been succeeded (768) by his two sons, Charles, afterwards known as Charlemagne, and Carloman, who married two daughters of Desiderius', Desiderata (or Ermingarde) and Gerberga. Carloman died at the end of the year 771, when Charles united the whole Frankish kingdom under his own rule, ousting the sons of his dead brother, who with their mother took refuge with their grandfather Desiderius. Charles repudiated Ermingarde, thus breaking off all friendly relations with the Lombard kingdom. Desiderius in his turn tried to induce the new Pope, Hadrian I (772–795), to consecrate the sons of Carloman as kings; but Hadrian had gone over to the Frankish party. Desiderius then invaded the Roman Duchy. A party favouring the Frankish king had formed in the ranks of the Lombard nobility, while the Lombards of Spoleto were allies of the Pope.

Under these circumstances the final issue of the struggle between the Frankish kingdom and the Lombard dynasty could not be in doubt. Charles descended into Italy by the Val di Susa, circumventing the barricades, and the Lombard army melted away before him (773). Desiderius shut himself up in Pavia, but surrendered the following year, and was confined in a French convent. His son Adelchi, already his partner upon the throne, held out for some time in Verona, but then fled to Constantinople (774). Charles was acknowledged as King of all the Lombards. At Easter 774 he went to Rome, where he was solemnly welcomed by the pontiff, in whose favour he confirmed the Donation of Pippin.

## CHAPTER V

### *FRANKISH ITALY, THE FEUDAL ANARCHY, AND THE ROMANO-GERMANIC EMPIRE*

§ 25. CHARLEMAGNE AND THE POPES. THE NEW EMPIRE OF THE WEST.—The dispossession of the Lombard dynasty did not entail the end of the Lombard kingdom, with its absorption into the Frankish dynasty. A few years later Charles established his son Pippin as his lieutenant in Pavia, and the Pope consecrated him as king in Rome (781). The “Kingdom of the Lombards” was known also as the “Kingdom of Italy,” and finally the latter name replaced the former. In the governments of the cities, and still more in the central government, the Frankish element appeared side by side with the Lombard element; the territorial circumscriptions were for the most part unchanged, but the dukes were replaced, in accordance with Frankish usage, by counts. The latter had under them *centenari* and *vicari*, who replaced the Lombard *sculdasci* and *gastaldi*; but the two latter terms were still employed by the Italians. Besides the Frankish officials there were, of course, private persons who were rewarded by the king with lands in the Lombard kingdom; so, side by side with the Lombard nobility, a Frankish nobility arose, the Italians being subject to both (“there were both the peoples on their neck”: Manzoni). Franks and Lombards continued each to observe their own laws, just as the Italians or Romans observed the Roman law.

In Central Italy the Lombard Duchy of Spoleto continued to exist as part of the Lombard kingdom of Charlemagne; and the attempts of the Pope to assert his old suzerainty over the duchy were fruitless. The pontifical state itself, consisting essentially of the Exarchate with Pentapolis and the Roman duchy, was subject to the overlordship of Charlemagne in his capacity of *patricius Romanorum*. To the south of the Papal dominions the Duchy of Benevento was still ruled by its two Lombard dukes, who now assumed the title of “Princes of the

Lombards." They made submission to Charles, but after doing so they oscillated between recognition of the Frankish and of the Byzantine suzerainty, actually remaining independent. Naples, however—still governed, with the surrounding territory, by the local dukes, who were practically autonomous—remained much more constantly within the Byzantine sphere. Over Benevento also the Roman pontiff claimed the rights of suzerainty, on the grounds of temporal agreements which had been concluded in the past; and Pope Hadrian, intent on the temporal aggrandisement of the Roman Church, obtained from Charles the acknowledgement of his title to Capua and another city, which, however, remained in effect in the principality of Benevento. The Byzantine Emperor retained, in addition to suzerainty over Naples, the theme of Sicily and Calabria. (The "themes" were the new circumscriptions established by Leo III, whose forces were united under military commanders.)

The Carolingian conquest had an important influence over the destinies of Italy. The Italic kingdom was now included in the sphere of a much wider empire, whose centre of gravity was outside Italy; a change which struck a serious blow at the possibilities of Italian autonomy and unification. While by the Lombard conquest Italy was split in two, with the Frankish conquest the division was much more serious. In addition to Northern Italy, the seat of the kingdom, there were in Central Italy the Papal dominions and the Duchy of Spoleto, while in Southern Italy a Byzantine Italy, itself divided into several parts, and a Lombard Italy, itself divided before long, confronted and intersected each other. Thus, in one part of Italy there was a greater dependence upon a foreign power, and in another part an increase of autonomous developments, accompanied, however, by a process of fragmentation which hindered the formation of strong and stable states.

The successor to Hadrian I, Pope Leo III (795–816), was even more subject to the Frankish Empire than his predecessor. The revolt of a party of the Roman aristocracy proclaimed his deposition for adultery and perjury (799), compelling him to take refuge with the Frankish count. Charles took measures for his restoration, and at the end of 800 he himself proceeded to Rome. The Pope, upon whom the bishop present in Rome urged the principle that the Roman see could not be

judged by anyone, purged himself in St. Peter's by his oath that the accusations were false, and his enemies were condemned. The pontiff was now more than ever conscious of the need of strengthening his position, of defining the nature of his bond with the Frankish king, and of giving a juridical basis, in consonance with the new ideas, to his sovereignty over Rome, and his separation from the Byzantine Empire. Consequently, on Christmas Day, A.D. 800, when mass was being said in St. Peter's, the Roman populace acclaimed Charlemagne, wishing "life and victory to the most pious Carolus Augustus, crowned by God, the great and pacific Emperor"; and the Pope crowned Charles, paying him homage (*adoratio*) upon his knees.

Thus was restored the Empire of the West; but under equivocal conditions, and by a juridical act which was hardly in correspondence with the reality of the case. It should have been the continuation or the restoration of the Roman Empire, which had its foundations in the people, the Senate, and the army. Even if the acclamations of the people in St. Peter's might be regarded as answering to this fundamental requirement, the coronation of Charles by the pontiff represented the intervention of a novel element, whose relation to the former requirement was by no means clear. The new Emperor should have been the true sovereign of Rome, and as such, the temporal sovereign of the Pope himself; and Leo III recognized this by the act of *adoratio*. At the same time, however, it was the Pope who had performed the decisive act of investiture, thus making himself the dispenser, and therefore the controller, of the imperial crown. To this may be attributed the displeasure which Charlemagne manifested in respect of the ceremony of Christmas Day, 800. In the first act of the constitution of the new Roman Emperor of the West were the germs of future conflicts between the Papacy and the Empire for the supreme government of Christendom.

The new political creation was ambiguous also in respect of territorial extension. Although we are accustomed to speak of the restoration of the Empire of the West, Charlemagne and his successors called themselves simply Roman emperors. Yet there was inherent in their monarchy a claim to universality, as in that of the emperors of Constantinople. Hence the conflicts that were presently to arise between

the new Empire and the old; and hence, moreover, the uncertainty in the mutual relations between the two emperors themselves and the sovereigns of other Western states who did not bear the imperial title. For the time being this second difficulty was not apparent, since the Frankish Empire was the only great State of Western Europe. From the very fact that the existence of the Empire had become a reality before the title had been conferred by Rome, and quite independently of the latter, there resulted yet another profound anomaly in the new creation, whose juridical title and formal centre did not in any way coincide with the true origin of its power or the territorial basis of the latter. The Empire of Charlemagne did not derive from the Roman investiture of Christmas 800, but from his own enterprise, and that of his predecessors, which had extended its dominions from the North Sea to Northern Italy, and from the Elbe and the Danube to the Atlantic Ocean and the Ebro. The nucleus of the Empire was the Frankish kingdom, not Roman Italy.

For Italy, the creation of the Empire had confirmed and reinforced the consequences of the Frankish conquest. The foreign state to which Italy was tied assumed the juridical title and the historic prestige of the Roman Empire. The mirage of the restoration of this Empire deluded the Italians as to their actual situation and distracted their attention from their national problems. Juridically they were the dispensers of the supreme imperial authority, which had its seat in their midst; but since in reality the effective strength of the Empire was outside Italy, the latter became dependent upon a foreign country. The reaction to this was a revival of the Byzantine claims upon Italy, which before long manifested themselves in a resumption of effective intervention. The Western Empire, having its centre of gravity and its capital interests beyond the Alps, could not undertake the task of creating a united Italy, notwithstanding its recurring desire to do so. There were periods—as we shall see—which the Western Empire once more coincided, as at the end of the Roman Empire, with Italy; but then the basis of its imperial and political power was unduly restricted, above all as compared with local developments: feudalism of the North and the Centre, the temporal dominion of the Pope, and the principalities and cities of the South.

Under Charlemagne, the founder of the new Empire, Italy was of secondary importance in the sphere of imperial activity. The Empire was infinitely more interested in the subjection of the Saxons or the repression of the Avars than in its relations with the Duke of Benevento. The Frankish intervention was consequently ineffectual, both in Southern Italy and in the north-eastern selvedge of the peninsula, confronting Venetia. In both territories the Frankish Empire came into conflict with its Byzantine predecessor, in whose eyes it was illegitimate. Charlemagne made war upon the Emperor Nicephorus (802-811), and one of the principal objects of this war was to decide which Empire was to exercise suzerainty over Venetia. The confederation which had been formed between the islands of the Venetian lagoon had continued to develop its autonomous life under its own Doges, while the Byzantine and then the Lombard power was declining in Italy. It had, however, remained politically dependent on Constantinople, and had maintained close commercial and cultural relations with the Eastern capital; while the Doge of Venice was still regarded as deriving his power from the emperor. On the establishment of Frankish rule in Upper Italy, and in consequence of internal conflicts, especially between the Doge and the Patriarch of Grado, a Frankish party had been formed in Venice, which seems to have been victorious in the early years of the new century. But a powerful Byzantine fleet reduced Venetia to its former state of subjection to the Eastern Empire; and then the King of Italy, Pippin, undertook an expedition against the lagoons (810). Venice offered energetic resistance, and under these circumstances the seat of government, which had already been moved from Heraclea, on the mainland, to Malamocco, was now established on Rivoalto or Rialto, and around it rose the city of Venice. In the end the Venetians were compelled to acknowledge the supremacy of the Frankish king; but when the two Empires concluded peace at Aquisgranum in 812 Venice was acknowledged by the Frankish Empire as dependent on the Byzantine Empire.

With this peace the Empire of the West acknowledged also the possessions of the Eastern Empire in Southern Italy. Thus both in the North and the South it renounced its claim to include the whole peninsula.

## § 26. THE FRANKISH ORGANIZATION. FEUDALISM.

The formal creation of the Empire did not in any way alter the organization of the kingdom of Longobardia, which remained under the vicarial government of King Pippin. The local politico-administrative circumscriptions were still governed by the counts; and in certain frontier zones known as *Marches* (the term was Germanic) several counts were grouped under the control of a marquis, who might himself be the direct ruler of a county. The count, like the Lombard duke or *gastaldo*, united the civil and military powers. His two principal duties were to dispense justice and to recruit for the army the men under obligation to perform military service, whom he then commanded in war. The first function was exercised by the count in a particularly solemn form, in the county assembly, or *placita*, which was convoked at least twice a year. Ordinarily the count adjudicated with the assistance of a body of assessors, known as judges in Italy and sheriffs beyond the Alps. Bishops and abbots, and in general all persons who were directly dependent on the king, were exempt from the county jurisdiction. Below the count, acting on his behalf, and governing the lesser circumscriptions, were the viscounts, vicars, and *centenarii*. The recruitment of the army was on a basis of territorial ownership; every landowner was also a soldier, and was bound to serve in time of war, together with his vassals (q.v.) if he had any. Military service was onerous and costly, as the landowner had to leave his property and find the greater part of the expenses of maintenance; so the smaller proprietors were allowed to unite in groups and to provide a single soldier for each group.

The counts and marquises were directly responsible to the central authority of the king or his representative, the count of the palace (*Pfalzgraf*). From time to time the king or the *Pfalzgraf* summoned the magnates of the kingdom to an assembly (called *placita*, like the county assembly), which was a supreme political and judicial body whose deliberations affected the whole kingdom. Above the royal assemblies were the general assemblies of the Empire, which Charlemagne convoked in the spring, and whose laws (*capitolari*) were valid throughout the Empire. The capitularies of Charlemagne provide for increased intervention on the part of the state, the suppression of the



private vendetta, the protection of the weaker elements of the population (widows, orphans, and the poor), and measures to regulate and develop economic life and the welfare of the people; they are also designed to stimulate the religious life of the community, and to provide for better education.

As opposed to these measures, which were directed toward reinforcing the central power, Charlemagne's reign saw the development of the Frankish institutions of the *beneficio* and *immunitas*. These tended in precisely the opposite direction—toward the constitution of feudal society. The Merovingian kings, in order to secure the attachment of their own supporters in their dynastic struggles, and to make sure of armed forces, had made liberal concessions of the corn lands. These were held on what was known as precarious titles: that is, temporary titles, the holder enjoying the usufruct only; but in practice these concessions often became hereditary possessions. To these "benefices" were added privileges by which the authority of the government was restricted on these territories, to the advantage of the beneficiary. The Carolingians continued these practices, though they imposed a closer relation between the holding of a benefice and the military service on horseback to which the beneficiaries pledged themselves. Between the person who conceded the benefice (*signore, senior, seigneur*) and the beneficiary (vassal) a peculiar relation was established, known as vassalage, which was a personal bond (to a great extent replacing the legal bond between sovereign and subject), by which the vassal owed loyalty and certain definite services to the seigneur, while the seigneur owed protection, aid and justice to the vassal. Under Charlemagne and his successors not only land was granted in benefice, but also private and public rights, attached to the land itself: rights of fishing and hunting, of levying tolls and customs, and lastly, the true and proper offices of government (countships, marquisates, etc.). The estates or privileges thus granted were known as *fiefs*, and the person to whom they were granted was a feudatory. In this way the functionaries were to a greater and greater extent transformed into vassals, and the power of the sovereign was dependent upon the loyalty of these vassals. But even when the official was not transformed into the vassal, his power, and therefore the power of the sovereign whom

he represented, was increasingly diminished, and almost annulled, by the privileges accorded to the vassals residing within his administrative circumscription. The immunity conceded to the estates of the vassal took the form, from the beginning, of exemption from certain public charges (imposts, work performed for the government); but afterwards the State renounced, in favour of the subject, its right of exercising its own authority over the latter's territory. The very freemen who lived within the confines of the territory could not be cited to appear in a court of law by the royal functionaries, nor could they have recourse to it, save through the intervention of the feudatory or a representative of his, known as an "advocate."

These freemen, for that matter, were rapidly diminishing in numbers. In order to obtain protection, or evade the public services, many small landowners surrendered their property to a great feudatory and received them again *in beneficio*. In this manner a seigneurial hierarchy was formed. The feudatory, himself immune, administered justice to the vassals, colonists, and slaves on his own territories; so that henceforth the seigneurial courts began to compete with the courts of the royal officials, though the right of appeal from both to the king's tribunal was still admitted.

The organization of the army underwent a transformation analogous to that which occurred in the sphere of justice and financial administration. The king's vassal was bound to render military service precisely by virtue of his bond of vassalage, and his vassals were bound to render the same service to him. The direct power of the king and his officials to recruit the army was greatly reduced and indeed almost annulled.

Side by side with the lay feudalism an ecclesiastical feudalism was developing. The great ecclesiastical estates, notwithstanding the extensive secularization accomplished by the Carolingians, beginning with Charles Martel, were always being reconstituted by fresh donations. Charlemagne and his successors made liberal concessions of benefices and immunities to the churches and monasteries. Bishops and abbots were beginning to become great lords, taking part in the royal and imperial assemblies as the equals of counts and marquises. On the other hand, the Carolingians regularly intervened in the appointment

of bishops and abbots, as the Merovingians had done before them. Charlemagne, especially, regarded himself as the supreme governor of the Frankish Church, not only in matters of organization and ecclesiastical discipline, but even in the doctrinal sphere, and the Church acknowledged him as such without dispute, while his attitude was at least tolerated by the pontiffs. In the ecclesiastical as in the civil sphere he effected a more rigid and uniform organization. The whole Empire was finally divided into a score of archiepiscopal sees, in each of which were grouped together the bishops within its territory. In Italy the bishops of Rome, Ravenna, Milan, Aquileia and Grado were archbishops, or metropolitans, as they were also called. The bishop had at least the right of supreme supervision over every ecclesiastical institution in his diocese. The rural churches were mostly the private foundations of landowners and *signori* (seigneurs: known as patrons), so that the latter had the right of selecting the priest, who had, however, to be ordained by the bishop, and remained subject to the disciplinary power of the latter. It was mainly under this combination of private signorial rights and ecclesiastical authority that the parishes came into being. The monasteries were independent, as regards their internal life, beginning with the nomination of the abbot, but were subject to episcopal supervision. The Carolingians favoured the observance in the monasteries of the Benedictine rule, and especially of the reformed Rule of the abbot Benedict of Aniane (d. 821). The bishops had to devote themselves above all to spiritual matters, nominating *advocati ecclesiae* for temporal affairs; they had also to make visitations and convoke synods. Of all priests a certain minimum of religious instruction and knowledge of the liturgy and the canon law was required, in addition to regular preaching and the exercise of the general duties of the pastoral ministry.

§ 27. ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL CONDITIONS.—The economic basis of Carolingian society was property in land. Between the system of great autonomous estates and incipient feudalism a sort of circulation was established, to the mutual advantage of both institutions. Among the great estates there was still a distinction between the *mansus dominicus*, directly administered by the owner, and the estates

held on lease in return for certain dues in kind. On the estates of the first category a great part of the land was still woodland or pasture, while the rest produced the corn and other crops required by the seigneur and his family. The leased holdings were more intensively cultivated. They were especially numerous on the great ecclesiastical estates, where better and securer conditions obtained. During the period of Charlemagne there was a certain development of methods and types of agriculture. In Italy we note a certain persistence of the small estate, and therefore of freemen.

Notwithstanding the prevalence of the agricultural economy, commerce had never completely disappeared, and in the 9th century it already began to show some increase. In the Padanian plain more especially (basin of the Po), thanks very largely to the navigable rivers, an exchange of products developed between Venice, which imported wares from the East, especially articles of luxury, and the mainland; a trade which affected even the heart of the Empire. Thanks to this commercial activity Venice was repeatedly granted privileges by the Frankish kings. This commercial movement was accompanied by greater refinement of household furniture and personal clothing and adornment. In the cities and seigneurial *villae* there were workers in the precious metals. In addition to wholesale commerce, there were local markets in the neighbourhood of the cities and the monasteries. In the kingdom of Italy something approaching a century of almost complete peace did much to assist this economic revival, and it must also have resulted in an increase of population.

Some writers have spoken of a Carolingian renaissance in the sphere of culture; but this is an exaggeration. There was a certain increase of culture at the close of the 8th and the beginning of the 9th century. The centre of this revival was a sort of academy which Charlemagne established in his court, with the assistance of the most learned persons in his Empire, appointing as its president the Anglo-Saxon monk Alcuin, who in his writings (of course, in Latin) dealt not only with theology, but with logic, grammar, and morals. Under Alcuin a palace school was established; and according to the capitularies of Charlemagne there should have been, in connection with every cathedral and monastery, a school not only for the secular and regular clergy, but

also for the laity. In these schools were taught, in accordance with the traditions of late antiquity, the seven liberal arts, divided into the two groups of the *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric, dialectic) and the *quadrivium* (arithmetic, geography, music, astronomy). Among the instruments of culture were the libraries of the monasteries, in which the monks spent much of their time in copying manuscripts.

Italy took part in this cultural movement, and in particular she contributed various Lombard writers to the Carolingian academy. The greatest of these was Paul Deacon (Paulus Diacones), the author of epistles and poems, but above all of the famous *Historia Langobardorum*, which he wrote in the monastery of Monte Cassino. This is the principal source for the history of the Lombard kingdom, and it is also a work of artistic value, so frank and lively is the narrative. Other Lombard writers at the court of Charlemagne were Peter of Pisa and Paulinus of Aquileia, who were particularly appreciated as grammarians; the latter became bishop of Aquileia. In general, the contribution of the monks to literature took the form of the registration of the more important events of the time in their "Annals" (of which, however, but few examples are extant in Italy), or of hagiography—that is, the biographies of saintly persons, bishops, abbots, and missionaries, all impregnated with edifying and miraculous elements. On the whole, the state of culture was rather low in Italy; lower than in Francia. A capitulary of the Emperor Lothar (§ 28) speaks expressly of the death of scholarship in Italy. To remedy this state of affairs he named a series of cities of the Italic kingdom in which a public school was to be opened for the inhabitants of the surrounding region (Pavia, Turin, Cremona, Verona, Vicenza, Cividale, Florence, Fermo). We do not know how far this scheme was carried out; probably it remained to a great extent a dead letter. We know, however, that a Scottish monk, Dungalo (*sic*) was established as a teacher in Pavia.

With greater justification, however, we may speak of a revival of art during the Carolingian period. Charlemagne carried out a remarkably active building programme at Aquisgranum (Aix-la-Chapelle) and elsewhere, and gave orders for the restoration of churches, monasteries and palaces throughout the Empire. During the Lombard period Italy was practically a Byzantine province, although the Roman tradition

never completely disappeared. Side by side with the preponderant art of mosaic, the art of fresco painting was preserved in Rome; we have examples in the frescoes of the 8th century which decorate the walls of Santa Maria Antiqua in the Roman Forum. As for sculpture, there was in Rome, and even more in Ravenna, a continual production of sarcophagi on which historical subjects were sculptured, in which the ornamental and symbolical motives predominated over the representation of the human figures. The production of bas-reliefs had become increasingly rare, while the sculpture of the figure "in the round" had practically ceased. There had also been, especially in the lesser arts (goldsmith's work and jewellery), a penetration of barbaric art, which is evident in certain objects in the treasury of the cathedral of Monza, which are alleged to have been presented by Theodelinda (among them is the Iron Crown of Lombardy). This *ars barbarica* had itself been modified by Oriental influences. Now, in the 9th century, there was a certain revival of the architectural arts. A few notable ecclesiastical buildings, or parts of such buildings, seem to date from the Carolingian period; for example, the apse of Sant'Ambrogio in Milan, and in northern Latium San Pietro in Tuscania. The famous and legendary school of the *maestri comacini* dates back to the close of the Lombard period. In Rome, at the beginning of the 9th century, there was a revival of the ornamental ecclesiastic arts: as in the mosaics of Santa Cecilia, Santa Prassade, Santa Maria in Domnica. In Sant'Ambrogio, Milan, there is an altar-piece of Sant'Ambrogio in sheet gold and silver, dating from the first half of the 9th century. With the removal of the body of St. Mark to Venice, in 828, and the subsequent erection of the basilica dedicated to the saint, the city of the lagoons became a centre of Byzantine art of the first importance, and this art was rivalled, as time went on, by the work of the Venetian artists.

§ 28. LOUIS II. THE MUSULMANS IN THE SOUTH.—When Charlemagne (d. 28 January 814) was succeeded by his son Louis the Pious nothing was changed in Italy, where Pippin, dying in 810, was succeeded as vicarial king by his son Bernard. But when Louis, in 817, provided for the government of the Empire by distributing dignities and appanages among his sons, Bernard, it seems, felt that his rights

were infringed, and rebelled against his uncle. The rebellion was quickly suppressed, and Bernard was blinded so barbarously that he died (818). The autonomistic tendencies of some of the lay and ecclesiastical magnates of the kingdom had been contributory causes of the rebellion. Italy was now entrusted by Louis to his eldest son, Lothar, already associated with his father in the government of the Empire. Lothar, like his father, had himself crowned a second time by Pope Pascal I in Rome (823): but he reasserted the authority of the Empire over Rome by the *Constitutio romana* (824), which set up in Rome a permanent representative (*missus*) of the Imperial authority. The Roman people had to take the oath of fealty to the emperor, and so had the elected Pope, before he could be consecrated.

The quarrels and civil wars between Louis the Pious and his sons, and between Lothar and his brothers, did not essentially affect the destinies of Italy. When Lothar, on succeeding to his father (840), was compelled to divide the Empire by the Treaty of Verdun (843) with his brothers Charles the Bald (who received Francia) and Louis the German (who was given Germania), he retained, together with the imperial title, the possession of Italy and a very long strip of territory beyond the Alps, reaching from the Mediterranean to the North Sea; so that he established his court at Aquisgranum (Aix-la-Chapelle), and did not return to Italy, entrusting its government to his elder son Louis II, crowned emperor in 850. On the death of his father in 855 Louis was left sole emperor.

Thus the Empire and the kingdom of Italy were closely amalgamated—first under Lothar, and then, more definitely, under Louis—and after the death of Lothar one may say that they coincided in a territorial sense, for Louis reigned over only a few tracts of territory beyond the Alps. With Louis II the imperial prestige and authority were effectively placed at the service of the Italic kingdom. During his reign this name very definitely began to take the place of the original name of the Lombard kingdom; and this seems to show, as against the dominant element of the Germanic race, a certain reinforcement of the local population, and the beginning of an ethnical and social amalgamation between the ruling caste and the subject people.

In the Italic kingdom properly so-called the authority of Louis was

maintained through thirty years of an uneventful reign. As emperor, moreover, he exercised in Rome all the rights conferred upon the Empire by Lothar's Constitution, and this meant that he had much more power in Rome than any of his predecessors or successors. But this did not enable him to eliminate the causes of discord and anarchy in the Papal principality, where the rivalry between the higher clergy and the lay nobility aggravated the process of feudal dissociation. Though the Papacy was extremely weak as a local power, it still maintained and asserted itself as the universal head of the Church. This was plainly seen in the case of Nicholas I (858-867), who had a high notion of the independence of the ecclesiastical power, and its superiority over the secular power, and of the supreme authority of the Papacy within the Church. He succeeded in overcoming the autonomistic tendencies of the Archbishop of Ravenna, though these were supported by Louis II, applied the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals (§ 29) to the affairs of the Frankish Church, and asserted his authority, in defiance of the Carolingian sovereigns, in respect of the divorce of Louis' brother Lothar II, the King of Lotharingia.

More than any Carolingian who preceded or followed him, Louis II concerned himself with Southern Italy, precisely because of its tendency to unite the whole peninsula under its authority. The situation which he found there, after fifty years of indifference on the part of his predecessors, was extremely involved. The principality of Benevento had been a robust and powerful state under its first two princes, Arichi and Grimoald. But by the first half of the 9th century the power of the prince had diminished as compared with that of the local governors (counts and *gastaldi*) and the autonomistic tendencies of some of the larger cities. Besides, the principality of Benevento had many competitors among the other states of Southern Italy. While Calabria was still under the rule of the Greeks—though in the first half of the 9th century they gave little sign of vitality—the cities of Naples, Gaeta, and Amalfi, which were powerful on the sea, had governments of their own, under the nominal suzerainty of the Empire of the East. The Prince of Benevento could neither live at peace with them nor subdue them. With the Duke of Naples especially his quarrels were bitter and frequent; the principal apple of discord being the Campanian



plain. After the death of Prince Sicard (839) the Principality of Benevento was disputed by two claimants, Radelchi and Siconolf. The latter had the support of Salerno, a city which rivalled Benevento, especially in respect of its maritime commerce. Both claimants sought the assistance of the Saracens, who had recently established themselves in Sicily.

From the 7th century the Musulmans of Africa had begun to make incursions into Sicily. At the beginning of the 9th century the Arab dynasty of the Aghlabites, the rulers of Tunis, redoubled the violence of these attacks. An expedition which was accompanied by Euphemius of Messina, a rebellious Byzantine captain, landed at Mazara in 827. In 831 Palermo was captured; but then the conquest proceeded more gradually. In 843 Messina fell; in 859 Enna (Castrogiovanni), the strongest position in the centre of the island. Now the only Greek possession left was a strip of territory in the east, including Syracuse, which fell in 878, and Taormina, which held out until 902.

The Musulmans of Sicily (a mixture of African Arabs, Berbers, and Spanish Arabs) made their way on to the mainland almost as soon as they had set foot in the island; more especially as auxiliaries and mercenaries of the local powers which were at war with one another. The first to invoke their aid—against Benevento—was Naples. Involved in the contest between Radelchi and Siconolf, they obtained a permanent footing in Apulia, and made themselves the masters of Taranto and Bari. Henceforth they became a menace in the Tyrrhenean, ravaging the coasts, making raids into the Roman Campagna, and even approaching the walls of Rome. They sacked the basilicas of San Pietro and San Paulo, which stood outside the walls. Naples formed a league with Gaeta and Amalfi, in order to defend the Tyrrhenean, or at all events the Gulf of Naples; Pope Leo IV built a wall round the Trastevere, which was henceforth known as “the Leonine City.”

In Lothar's lifetime, and by his orders, Louis II, in 847, made an expedition against the Saracens of Southern Italy, whom he defeated. While he was in the South he settled the quarrel between Radelchi and Siconolf by dividing the Principality of Benevento. Radelchi was given Benevento, with Samio and Apulia; while Siconolf received Salerno, with the Longobard territory of Campania, Lucania, and Northern Calabria. Capua, included in the Salernian dominion, quickly declared

its independence, so that there were three Lombard principalities instead of one.

About twenty years later Louis II succeeded in getting together a new and a larger expedition (867), with which he recaptured from the Saracens various fortresses in Apulia, and blockaded Bari, which was not conquered until 871. Attempts to come to an agreement with Byzantium, by which the Byzantine fleet would act in co-operation with the Frankish army, were without result, owing to the inevitable rivalry of the two Empires. This rivalry became more involved and embittered on account of the conflict between the Roman and Byzantine Churches, which under Nicolas I resulted in the schism of Fozio (867). There was a permanent dispute between Rome and Byzantium in respect of the jurisdiction over the churches of Southern Italy, which Leo III (§ 24) had surrendered to the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

In the principalities of Southern Italy there was opposition to the overlordship of Louis II. In Benevento there was an insurrection, and Louis was taken prisoner by Prince Adelchi (871). He was liberated on taking his oath that he would not seek to revenge himself; but he assembled a new army in Northern Italy, got the Pope to release him from his oath, and descended into Campania, then invaded by the Saracens. The latter were defeated near Capua, and compelled to raise the siege of Salerno. Both cities made submission to Louis II. Benevento, on the other hand, acknowledged as its overlord the Emperor of the East, Basil I, who sent a fleet to support it. Louis II, distracted by the state of affairs beyond the Alps, returned to Upper Italy. He died in 875, without male heirs.

§ 29. THE LAST OF THE CAROLINGIANS. THE FULL DEVELOPMENT OF FEUDALISM. With the death of Louis II the Italic kingdom lost its local sovereign, while the imperial dignity became the object of contest between the Frankish and Germanic Carolingians to the north of the Alps. Now Pope John VIII (872-882) came to the front, attempting to exercise the sovereign power on behalf of the imperial and royal crown of Italy, and to play the leading part in the affairs of the peninsula, while increasing the local power of the Papacy. Disappointing the aspirations of the German Carolingians, he came to

an understanding with Charles the Bald, King of Francia, whom he crowned emperor in Rome (Christmas 875). Charles renounced, in favour of the pontiff, a good portion of the imperial authority over Rome, and he wished also to make territorial donations in the Duchy of Spoleto and Southern Italy. John VIII, however, could not assert himself, with the forces at his disposal, against the nobles of the Roman duchy, and the Duke of Spoleto, who supported them. He received no assistance from his emperor against the Saracens, who were ravaging the Roman Campagna, nor could he induce the princes of the Southern cities to take effective action against them. Now the Saracens had established themselves on the Garigliano, and operating thence became the terror of Central Italy.

Charles the Bald having died in 877, his nephew Carloman, the son of Louis the German, who had already invaded Italy in order to claim the Italic kingdom, was acknowledged King of Italy in Lombardy. John VIII intrigued against him, but he met with the firm resistance of the Archbishop of Milan, Ansperto, one of the greatest magnates of Lombardy. Carloman, however, being stricken with paralysis, had to return to his kingdom of Bavaria, where he died two years later. His brother Charles the Fat, King of Swabia, succeeded to his claims, and was crowned King of Italy, while John VIII consented to confer the imperial crown upon him (Charles III, 881). He met with opposition from Guido, Duke of Spoleto, a powerful ruler of Frankish stock, and from other magnates. Owing to the death of his brothers in Germania, and his nephews in Francia, Charles III was acknowledged as sovereign in all the other Carolingian dominions. In 884 the Empire was re-established in its formal unity, but with nothing like its original power. Charles III was unable to defend Germany and France against the Normans, or Italy against the Saracens, nor could he assert his sovereign authority against the feudatories. At the Diet of Tribur (November 887) he was compelled to abdicate by a revolt of the German lay nobility, led by Arnulph of Carinthia, the illegitimate son of Carloman (887); and he died soon afterwards (888). Germany, France and Italy now proceeded to choose their own sovereigns.

John VIII was already dead (882), the victim of a revolt; having witnessed the complete failure of his policy. His ambitions were

great, but he lacked the strength to realize them. In Rome and the Roman Duchy the local aristocracy were more than ever in the ascendant, usurping the territorial possessions of the Church by the concession of benefices. The Exarchate, where the Archbishop of Ravenna had continued, under John VIII, to dispute the pontifical authority, was now able to repudiate it. The unstable local conditions formed by the Pope had been powerless to resist the Saracens, who still ravaged the countryside, advancing almost to the gates of Rome; so that John VIII had considered the expedient of appealing to Byzantium, adopting a conciliatory attitude in respect of ecclesiastical questions. The Emperor of the East, Basil II (867-886), did actually enter upon a policy of reconquest in the south, where the Carolingian emperor no longer took the field against him; but he did this only in the interests of the Empire. The Byzantines, having established themselves in Bari (875), proceeded to reconquer Calabria from the Saracens, and Apulia from the Saracens and the Lombards. Neighbouring upon the theme of Calabria, the theme of Longobardia (Apulia) was constituted, and about 970 the two were united under the "Catepano of Italy." The episcopal sees of the territory subjected to Byzantium became dependent upon Constantinople; Calabria was populated by Greek monks (and at the close of the 10th century the celebrated San Milo founded the monastery of Sant'Adriano near Rossano), and underwent an extensive Hellenization; a process to which Apulia proved very much more refractory. Then, by the first half of the 10th century, there were native revolts, accompanied by attacks from the Lombard principalities. The maritime cities, on the other hand (Naples and Amalfi), remained on better terms with the Byzantines, using them as a counterpoise against the Lombards.

Even in the 9th century the political influence of Byzantium made itself felt in Rome, where a Greek party began to emerge, in opposition to the Frankish or German party. Further to the north Venice continued to acknowledge the supremacy of the Eastern Empire, and was a centre of Byzantine culture.

In the kingdom of Italy the virtual interregnum which followed the death of Louis II fostered the full development of the feudality. Charles the Bald made great concessions to the Italian feudatories, no

less than to the Frankish, and these were confirmed on oath by true contractual pacts. By virtue of these concessions, or by usurpation, the great feudatories now exercised on their own account almost all the rights and privileges of royalty (administering justice, recruiting and commanding the army, building fortresses, exacting tribute, and even coining money), and sometimes, when leagued together, they controlled such little power as the sovereign still retained. King, royal officials and subjects were replaced by seigneur, vassals, and the vassals of vassals; and over these latter the sovereign could no longer exercise authority save through the medium of the seigneur. The land was split up into innumerable fiefs, great and small, in the midst of which there survived a comparatively small number of *allodia*: that is, estates held in unrestricted possession, independent of any feudal ties. In this way a complicated hierarchy was formed, at the head of which was the king, while at the bottom of the ladder were the simple *milites*, noble vassals of this or that seigneur, who like themselves might possess no land. Those who filled the intermediate grades were at once seigneurs and vassals. Thus, there were the great vassals or *principes* (dukes, marquises, counts, bishops, abbots), then the *valvasores* ("vassi vassorum," vavaseurs) *majores* (barons in Francia, *capitanei* or *Cattani* in Lombardy) and the *valvassores minores*. A mass of complicated regulations and rites, which for many centuries were customary, and not defined by the written law, governed this feudal society, either through the granting of the fief (investiture) or through mutual obligations, or through the annulment of the feudal relation. From being a temporary concession the fief became a lifelong possession unless it were revoked for "felony"; and later still it tended to become hereditary. The hereditary nature of the greater fiefs was recognized in principle by Charles the Bald. The possessor of the fief could even sell or donate it; and the heir, purchaser, or recipient entered into the relation of vassalage, with all the appertaining privileges and obligations.

Below the lay and ecclesiastical feudality were the cultivators of the soil (*villani*, villeins). These might be freemen or slaves, but in either case were bound to the soil; they did not render military service, nor did they enjoy the rights of association, or any other public privileges.

They owed to the seigneur of the land which they cultivated a mass of obligations which came, quite improperly, to be described as feudal dues. Some of these were paid in money or in kind; others took the form of a determined quota of labour. In addition to the ordinary dues there were extraordinary dues to be paid under special circumstances, when the seigneur visited the estate, when the fief changed hands, or when the seigneur's eldest son was married. There were also the monopolies or *banalità*, according to the terms of which the peasants had to carry their corn to be ground in the seigneur's mill, and take their bread to be baked in his oven, and postpone the sale of their crops in order to avoid competition with the seigneur, etc. Another source of seigneurial wealth was the administration of justice, since the penalties imposed commonly consisted of fines collected by the seigneur.

Feudal justice, which was governed, for the most part, by custom, was based on the fundamental principle that each class was amenable to its own tribunal: the peasant to the domestic tribunal of the seigneur; the vassal to the feudal court, a tribunal of his peers; the cleric to the episcopal and abbatial tribunals; the free population of the cities to the county tribunal. Decisions were reached in accordance with the evidence, or on the basis of an oath, or by the duel, or the *ordalia* (*ordeal*), or judgement (German *Urteil*) of God. The method of proof by means of testimony of witnesses or written depositories was derived from the Roman procedure; of proof by oath, from the Barbarian law. For the nobles the natural method of deciding a lawsuit was the duel, which was likewise a Germanic institution: the accused, instead of exculpating himself by offering testimony, challenged the accuser or the evidence against him. He could even fight by proxy (for example, when women were parties to the case). Not only criminal but also civil suits were decided by the duel. For those who were not noble, or who could not find representatives to fight for them, the means of settling a dispute was an extraordinary test, normally the ordeal by fire (plunging the hand into boiling water or grasping a red-hot iron).

At the close of the 9th century the great duchies or marquisates in Italy were: the marquisate of Friuli, the marquisate of Ivrea, in-

cluding a great part of Piedmont, the marquisate of Tuscany, with its capital at Lucca, and the duchy of Spoleto, divided into the two marches of Spoleto and Camerino. From the marquisate of Ivrea other marquisates detached themselves as time went on; in particular, the Aleramic March (from the name of its founder, Aleramo) in the second half of the 10th century, which extended from Monferrato to Liguria, and the march of Susa or Turin in Central Piedmont.

The ecclesiastical nobility profited no less than the lay nobility by the development of feudalism. Hitherto it had been a sort of counterpoise to the power of the counts and marquises, and the kings, indeed, showed a tendency to depend on its support against the lay nobles. Special public privileges were granted by the sovereigns to the bishops, as to the lay seigneurs; and in the 9th century there were bishops who were invested with comital power, or count-bishops. Next to the bishops, and only less powerful, were the abbots of the greater monasteries, around which the cultivators of the soil gathered in search of protection. The bishop fortified his palace in the city and his castles in the countryside. Bishops and abbots created vassals for their defence, granting them part of their lands in fief. Thus the higher clergy were definitely included in the feudal hierarchy; they took up arms and secularized themselves. Among the most powerful bishops of the Italic kingdom were those of Milan and Ravenna, who governed a number of other bishops by virtue of their archiepiscopal or metropolitan authority. The greatest abbots were those of Farfa in Sabina and Monte Cassino in Campania, both of whom were under the direct protection of the emperor. Other powerful abbots were those of Nonantola in Emilia, San Vincenzo at Volturno, and Casauria in the Abruzzi (founded by Louis II).

The Church, though it was affected by the feudal disintegration, maintained its unity more sensibly than lay society, and to a certain extent it succeeded in realizing the ideal of a common Christian society, by virtue of the religious faith which was cherished by all, and the fact that the clergy disposed of the means of communicating with the supernatural world. Exclusion from the community of the faithful and deprivation of the sources of supernatural grace offered by the sacraments were for the men of that age a most serious misfortune; so that

in excommunication the Church had a powerful means of domination. By the subordination of earthly to eternal life the whole of human existence came under the control of the Church, which made itself the supreme judge of the public and private life of all men, including the sovereigns themselves, thus reaching out from the strictly religious to the moral and political sphere. The canon law became the source—and one may say the only common source—of law for all men. Charlemagne had set up a State Church under his own immediate and continual direction; but it was disorganized by the disintegration of the Carolingian Empire, and the preponderance of the state over the Church was followed by the profound and comprehensive influence of the Church over the state. Thus a tendency arose to consider the ecclesiastical hierarchy as the supreme organ and true representative of Christian society; as being above the secular power, which was incapable of preserving the unity of this society.

This tendency was accompanied by an internal dispute within the Church between the power of the metropolitans, which in the Frankish Empire was essentially the institution of Charlemagne, and the power of the bishops and the inferior clergy: the first being more ready to seek support from the state (as we saw in the case of the Archbishop of Ravenna) and the second more jealous of their own independence and that of the Church in general. These latter naturally turned their gaze toward the Roman pontiff as the person best able to hold the metropolitans in check and to oppose the secular authorities. The compilation of canon law known as the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals (because its unknown author styled himself "Isidor Mercator") was inspired by this faction. It comprises a number of entirely spurious letters or decretals, attributed to various Popes, their purpose being to oppose the power of the pontiff, as supreme judge, to that of the metropolitans, the provincial synods, and the civil authorities. This work appeared in France about the middle of the 9th century, but it was rapidly diffused throughout the West.

The bishops resided and performed their ecclesiastical functions in the cities, so that the urban centres retained their importance, while the ecclesiastical and the secular element co-operated in their administrative activities.



§ 30. THE "INDEPENDENT ITALIC KINGDOM."—The period extending from the deposition of Charles the Fat (887) to the elevation of Otto I to the imperial throne (962) is known as that of the "independent Italic kingdom," because during this period the kingdom of Italy was not bound and subject to a foreign State, as it had been under the early Carolingians. There had already been such a period of independence under Louis II: but the present period had this peculiar feature, that the kings of Italy were created on the spot, being elected by the great Italian feudatories, and in most cases they were under the protection of one or another of the latter. For this very reason the Italic kings of this period were very much less powerful than the kings of the preceding period. We see a manifestation of feudal particularism—or even of concurrent feudal particularisms—rather than a first affirmation of a national personality, such as *Francia* and *Germania* revealed on the dissolution of the Carolingian Empire; the great feudatories of the Italic kingdom were Franks or Lombard by race, and were conscious of their origin. However, the bond between the kingdom of Italy and the Empire still existed. By the very fact that the imperial crown was conferred in Rome—that is, in close proximity to the frontiers of the Italic kingdom—every king of Italy very naturally aspired to obtain it, hoping to acquire thereby greater authority and prestige in his relations with his own feudatories, as well as the juridical right to exercise suzerainty over Rome and the state of the Church (which was dependent upon the Empire, not on the Italic kingdom), and also over the South, where only the Emperor of the West could make headway against the intervention of the Emperor of the East.

Among the successors of Charles the Fat, Arnulf, King of *Germania*, asserted his superiority, requiring the other new kings to do homage to him as the representative of the imperial ideal. Among these monarchs was Berengarius, Marquis of Friuli, a descendant, in the female line, of the Carolingians, who had formerly been the leader of the Italian faction which favoured the cause of the German Carolingians, and who was crowned king in Pavia (888). He was opposed by Guido, Duke of Spoleto, who has already been mentioned. Guido aspired not only to the kingdom of Italy, but also to the Empire. After

the victorious issue of a battle on the Trebbia, Guido in his turn was crowned at Pavia (889), while Berengarius was acknowledged in the north-east of Italy. Guido, in order to assure the succession to the crown, had his son Lambert acknowledged as his coadjutor on the throne. In the kingdoms which resulted from the dismemberment of the Carolingian Empire the king was elected (without any precise ritual) by an assembly of lay and ecclesiastical magnates, but the electoral principle was modified by a certain regard for the candidate's parentage, and by the fact that the reigning king often secured acknowledgement of his son as his successor. Guido had himself crowned Emperor in Rome by Pope Stephen V (891), and he had his son crowned (892) by the new Pope Formosus.

The Spoleatine dynasty, associating the traditions of its own ducal policy with those of Louis II, aspired to dominion over all Italy, and therefore over Rome and the South, where it repeatedly took the field against the Saracens, partly in order to assert its suzerainty over the Lombard principalities. Berengarius and Pope Formosus called upon Arnulf to intervene against it; Berengarius in the hope of recovering the Italic kingdom, even under the suzerainty of the King of Germany, and Formosus because an emperor who should be the immediate master of Italy seemed likely to be oppressive, so that he preferred one who would keep a greater distance. In other words, their temporal interests urged the Pope to avoid the formation in Italy of a strong and unitary power, and to invite foreigners to oppose such a development, as they had already done in the case of the Lombard kings. Arnulf descended into Italy, where he received the homage of a great proportion of the magnates, while Guido withdrew into Spoleto; but he was unable to reach Rome, as the way was blocked by the Marquis of Tuscany (894). In a second expedition against Lambert, who was alone, now that his father was dead (894), he succeeded in reaching Rome, took possession of the city, in the face of the Spoletan soldiery, and was crowned Emperor by Pope Formosus (896). Being overtaken by sickness, he was obliged to leave Italy: when Berengarius (who had found himself thrust completely into the background by Arnulf) came to an agreement with Lambert, contenting himself with the north-east of Italy down to the Adda. In Rome also the anti-

German faction was victorious, even going so far as to disinter the body of Formosus, in order to throw it into the Tiber after it had been condemned by a council. Lambert, as Emperor, ruled in agreement with the Popes, seeking, with them, to regularize the position of the Papal principality.

When Lambert died without heirs, in August 898, Berengarius was acknowledged as sole King of Italy, but he was unable to impose his rule on Central Italy, nor could he repair to Rome in order to receive the imperial crown. In Rome the local aristocracy was now completely victorious, led by one Theophylactus, with Theodora, his wife, and his daughters Theodora, and Marozia, who married one Albericus, who had become Marquis of Spoleto and Camerino. In Upper Italy Berengarius found himself confronted with the terrible scourge of an invasion by the Hungarians or Magyars, a Uralo-Altaic population which had settled towards the close of the 9th century in the region which took from them the name of Hungary, and had become the terror of Germany and Italy. One expedition of theirs (899-900) defeated Berengarius on the Brenta, and this was followed by a series of incursions, which were no longer resisted in the open field, but were opposed by means of the fortresses and cities, which were compelled to repair their walls or to build new ones; often with the help of the bishops. From Upper Italy the Hungarians made incursions into Central Italy, which was also raided at intervals by the Saracens, especially by those of the Garigliano, who came up from the South.

Against Berengarius, thus enfeebled and discredited, the quarrelsome magnates of Italy, and especially the Marquises Adalbert of Tuscany and Adalbert of Ivrea, raised up a competitor in the person of Louis, King of Provence or Cisiuran Burgundy (i.e. on this side of the Jura). Louis was crowned King of Italy in Pavia (900), and Emperor in Rome (901), but before long, owing to the unreliability of the magnates, he had to give way to Berengarius, withdrawing across the Alps and promising not to return. He did not keep his promise, but falling into the hands of Berengarius he was taken prisoner, blinded, and sent back to Provence (905), whence he did not again emerge.

Berengarius now enjoyed an undisputed reign of nearly twenty years, though he had little effective authority over the local governments. Unlike the emperor of the Spoletan dynasty, he did not pursue an active policy in respect of South Italy. About this time the Saracens were dislodged from the Garigliano (August 915) by a league between Pope John X (914-928), who had been raised to the pontificate by the Theophylactus family, but was none the less distinguished by his energy and personal initiative, the Marquis Alberic of Spoleto, the various states of Southern Italy, and the Byzantines. The coalition was not of long duration, and it effected nothing else of any note. A few months after the victory on the Garigliano, Berengarius, as his enemy Adalbert of Tuscany was dead, was able to proceed to Rome, where he was crowned emperor. But as emperor he had no greater authority than before, nor was he inspired to greater undertakings.

Going the rounds of the neighbouring sovereigns in search of competitors to oppose their own sovereign, and unwilling to obey any, the great Italian *signori* now turned to Rudolph, King of Upper Burgundy, who, having the pass of St. Bernard in his control, descended into Italy and defeated Berengarius at Fiorenzuola on the Arda (925). Berengarius sought help from the Hungarians, but they burned Pavia and advanced into Southern Italy without troubling further about the contending parties. He then shut himself up in his march, and was killed in Verona by one of his vassals (924). Rudolph was now unopposed. Guido, Marquis of Tuscany, and Ermengard, widow of the Marquis of Ivrea, appealed for help against him to their half-brother Hugh of Provence, Count of Vienne, in which they had the support of John X. Rudolph left Hugh in possession of the field, receiving in compensation certain rights in Provence which facilitated the union of the two Burgundies. Hugh was crowned in Pavia (926). Some years later (931) his son Lothar became his associate in the kingdom. Hugh, a vigorous and unscrupulous ruler, pursued a policy which was directed towards holding the feudality in subjection. He sought to invest his devoted Burgundians with bishoprics, abbeys and secular fiefs; and for twenty years he ruled Upper Italy with a firm hand. He also made himself the master of Tuscany, taking it from his half-brother Lambert; and with a view to establishing his rule over

Rome he married Marozia, the widow of Alberic of Spoleto and Guido of Tuscany, Lambert's brother. Marozia was now more than ever the mistress of Rome, having deposed John X, whom she caused to be put to death, and elevated her own son, as John XI, to the Papal throne. But immediately after the marriage of Hugh and Marozia in Rome a great revolt broke out against them, the Roman leader being Alberic, son of Marozia by her first marriage (932). Hugh was driven off; Marozia and John XI were thrown into prison, and for twenty-two years (932-934) Alberic governed the Roman duchy under the nominal suzerainty of the Pope, taking the title of "principo et senator Romanorum." As far as we can judge, he preserved the internal order and effective independence of the State; he also interested himself in the reform of ecclesiastical discipline. King Hugh made a number of vain attempts to take the city; but he succeeded in holding Spoleto and the Papal territories beyond the Apennines. Alberic entered into relations with the Emperor of Constantinople, perhaps to oppose the Greek influence to the Frankish pretensions to Rome. However, King Hugh also was on good terms with Byzantium; one of his daughters married a Byzantine prince; and a Byzantine fleet took part in his expedition against the Saracens of Spain who had established themselves at Fraxinetum (La Garde-Freinet) in Provence, and were ravaging the south of France and the north of Italy. Hugh, however, did not carry this enterprise to its conclusion, for he regarded the Saracens who had established themselves in the Alpine passes as his possible allies against any hostile movements on the Alpine frontier. He had little faith in the loyalty of the dynasty of Ivrea, and he tried to capture the Marquis Berengarius, the son of Adalbert and Ermengard. Berengarius managed to escape to Germany, where he took refuge with Otto I. Returning to Italy (945) with German troops, by way of the valley of the Adige, he found that a large faction of the magnates was in his favour; so that Hugh and Lothar, although nominally retaining the crown, had to surrender the *de facto* government to him. Hugh returned to Provence, and died there; Lothar too died shortly afterwards, and Berengarius II, with his son Adalbert, was crowned at Pavia (950).

§ 31. THE ROMANO-GERMANIC EMPIRE.—Otto I of Saxony, King of Germany in 936, had raised himself to a position of considerable power, a position which enabled him to exercise a preponderant influence over Western Christendom. Reverting to the Carolingian tradition, he aspired to the kingdom of Italy and the Empire. Berengarius II gave him more than one opportunity of intervening in Italy; firstly, by turning to him during the reign of King Hugh, and secondly, by his persecution of Lothar's widow Adelaide, who took refuge with Otto, leaving behind her in Italy a party ready to invoke the aid of the King of Germany against the house of Ivrea. Otto I, on the pretext of avenging and liberating Adelaide, descended through the Brenner Pass with a huge army, and Berengarius, abandoned by the Italian magnates, was forced to retreat into the mountains of Ivrea. In Pavia Otto was proclaimed king, and there he married Adelaide (951); he also attempted to reach Rome, but was unable to do so, owing to the opposition of Alberic.

On returning to Germany, Otto consented to invest Berengarius II and Adalbert with the kingdom of Italy as his vassals; but he detached from this kingdom the marches of Verona and Aquileia, joining them to the Duchy of Bavaria, and thus creating a gate opening upon Italy. Berengarius, on resuming the government, endeavoured to consolidate his position and to revenge himself upon his enemies; Otto, appealed to by the latter, sent his son Liudolf against him, but the expedition was interrupted by his sudden death (957), and Berengarius proceeded to govern the country in his own fashion, subjecting the bishops who were opposed to him to special persecution. His son Adalbert, claiming jurisdiction over the Exarchate, came into conflict with Pope John XII (955-964), the son of Alberic, who had united the temporal and spiritual powers. Abandoning the traditions of his fathers, the Pope appealed to Otto, thereby smoothing the way for his imperial ambitions. Otto marched into Italy, where Berengarius was in no position to meet him in open battle, and on the 2 February 962 he received the imperial crown in Rome. This was the beginning of the union between the crowns of Germany, Italy, and the Empire, and in this way the "Holy Roman Empire of the Germanic Nation" was constituted. He who was elected King of Germany was by that

election chosen to wear the royal crown of Italy. However, in Italy the election of the king by the Italian magnates continued for a time; and despite the union of the two crowns of Italy and Germany, each kingdom preserved its individual entity, with its own laws and customs.

Otto I confirmed the Carolingian donations to the Papacy by a diploma; but in actual fact the sovereignty of the pontiff was restricted to the Roman Duchy, and in the Exarchate especially the Emperors long continued to exercise their direct authority. In Rome the Emperor re-established the rights of suzerainty sanctioned by the Constitution of Lothar (§ 28), while the Pope and the people of Rome took the oath of fealty to him. It was not long before John XII had reason to complain of the Emperor, because the latter did not consign to the pontiff all the territories included in the donation, and he entered into an understanding with Berengarius, who was holding out in the fortress of San Leo in Montefeltro. Thereupon Otto, returning to Rome, made an affirmation of imperial authority which was then without precedent: he convoked a Council, which deposed John XII and elected a new Pope, Leo VIII, and he also compelled the Romans to take oath that they would not henceforth elect a pontiff without his previous approval. From now onwards there began in Rome a series of conflicts between the imperial authority and local autonomies. The autonomist party included both secular and ecclesiastical elements, though the latter predominated, the territorial nobility seeking to control the election of the pontiff in the place of the Emperor. The anti-Germanic party was inclined to rely on Byzantine support. After Otto's departure John XII was restored to the Papal throne, and on his death Benedict V was elected (904) without regard for the oath. Otto returned to Rome and restored Leo VIII, who was succeeded—this time by agreement with the Emperor—by John XIII (965), while a new anti-imperial revolt was severely punished. As for Berengarius II, he was arrested and imprisoned in Germany. His son Adalbert made some attempts to rescue him, but without success.

It now remained to take measures in respect of Southern Italy. Otto I, reviving the Carolingian traditions (and also, one may add, the Spoletan), aimed at asserting over the southern states his own

suzerainty in the place of the Byzantine. He found a supporter there in the Prince of Capua and Benevento, Pandulph, known as "Testa di Ferro," to whom he gave Spoleto and Camerino: an artificial union which was of brief duration. On the failure of negotiations with the Emperor of the West, Nicephorus Phocas, Otto repeatedly invaded the Byzantine territories of Southern Italy, but was unable to gain possession of the fortresses. With Phocas' successor, John Zimisce, was concluded the peace by which Capua and Benevento were recognized as subject to the suzerainty of the Western Empire, while the rest of the disputed territories remained subject to the Eastern Empire. A matrimonial alliance between the two Empires was concluded with the marriage of Otto II (972), already crowned Emperor, and the Greek princess Theophano. In this same year the Saracens were driven out of their Provençal base at Fraxinetum.

In the kingdom of Italy Otto I, in accordance with the policy followed in Germany, favoured the episcopate to the detriment of the lay feudality. In so doing he was merely accentuating a development already begun under the Carolingians, and still more strongly marked in the period of the so-called Italic kingdom. A great many administrative rights had been united in the hands of the bishops, whose power therefore replaced that of the counts in the cities, where—unlike the counts—they resided permanently. In many cases the comital power had been formally conferred upon the bishops (count-bishops); in other cases they exercised this power *de facto*. The power of the count was thus restricted to the rural area, which for this reason became known as *contado*, but even here the ecclesiastical estates enjoying *immunitas* were excluded. As regards the internal life of the cities this state of affairs had important consequences. The bishops, in fact, being engaged in ecclesiastical administration, called upon the more eminent citizens to take part in the administration of the cities, together with their representative, who was known as an *advocate* or *viscount*, and in this way began a renaissance of municipal life.

Otto II (973–983), already associated with his father in the government of the Empire and the kingdom, was for some years after his father's death detained beyond the Alps by the affairs of Germany. Meanwhile in Rome the two factions—the anti-imperial faction of the



Crescenzi and the imperial faction of the Counts of Tusculum—were struggling for dominion over the city and the pontificate. In 980 Otto II came down into Italy and asserted his authority over Rome. He then passed into Southern Italy, with the intention of winning a decisive campaign against the Musulmans of Sicily, who were continuing their incursions. Sicily, since 947, had been governed by the hereditary Emirate of the Chelbites, which was practically autonomous under the suzerainty of the Fatimids, who had succeeded to the Aglabites in the government of Algeria and Tunisia, and had also conquered Egypt, in which country they then resided. The Chelbites had defeated the Byzantines in Calabria. Otto II was no more successful against them. Notwithstanding the support of the Prince of Capua he suffered a serious defeat at Stilo in Calabria (Capo delle Colonne), barely managing to escape (982). In the following year Otto II died in Rome.

His son, Otto III (983–1002), was still a boy. His mother Theophano and his grandmother Adelaide governed in his name. He actually assumed the imperial power in 995, and in the following year he repaired to Rome, where Giovanni Crescenzio governed the city from the Mole Adriana, which had been transformed into a fortress since the days of Alberic. Crescenzio, however, did not resist the Emperor, who was able to fill the Papal throne, then vacant, by the nomination of his kinsman, Gregory V: the first German Pope. When Otto had taken his departure Crescenzio resumed the powers of government, raising the populace and expelling the Pope; and he proposed to restore the ancient republic under the protection of the Eastern Empire. To this end he caused a Calabrian Greek to be elected: John Philagathus, a person acceptable to Byzantium, who took the name of John XVI. Otto III hurried back to repress the revolt: Crescenzio was hanged, Pope John was imprisoned and mutilated (998).

This time Otto did not again leave Rome, but established his seat there, meaning to restore the ancient Empire and to govern Roman Christendom, in the temporal and spiritual order, from Rome, as its supreme head, in complete accordance with the pontiff, who was dependent upon him. He formed his court on the Byzantine model, gave his officials Graeco-Roman names, and ordered the judges to

observe the Roman law, thinking to absorb the various national elements in the universal "Romanity." An integral part of his plans was the submission of the whole Catholic Church to the Roman pontiff; and in this he naturally had the support of Pope Sylvester II (999-1003), whom he had placed on the Papal throne on the death of his cousin. Sylvester, before succeeding to the Papal dignity, had been celebrated, under his name of Gerbert, for his erudition, and had already attained high ecclesiastical dignities, among them that of Archbishop of Ravenna. Pope and Emperor were both meditating a reform of the Church; and to this end Otto had got into touch with various distinguished figures in the monastic world—more especially Italians, such as St. Nilus (§ 29) and St. Romuald (§ 33). These plans, and this mode of government, did not meet with the same approval from the Germans, who felt that the Emperor was neglecting German interests. Nor did the Roman population allow itself to be seduced by the imperial dreams. In 1001 a rebellion broke out in Rome, and Otto, having left the city, was unable to re-enter it. While he was besieging Rome he died at Paterno, near Civitacastellana (1002), and his soldiers contrived, with great difficulty, to carry his body back to Germany.

## CHAPTER VI

### *THE FIRST CONFLICT BETWEEN PAPACY AND EMPIRE: AND THE NORMANS IN THE SOUTH*

§ 32. NEW FORMATIONS IN LOMBARDY AND THE SOUTH.—At the beginning of the 11th century symptoms of a new life made their appearance in Italy. In the feudal world great importance was assumed by the caste of the *secundi milites*—that is, of inferior vassals, holding their land in fief from the greater vassals, and in particular from the ecclesiastics. The *secundi milites* were generally native Italians, or Italianate aliens (mostly Lombards), and in many cases they were townsmen, who combined some urban occupation in the city with the possession of feudal territory. Their rising importance therefore coincided with a renaissance of civic life. And so, besides the maritime cities of Southern Italy, the cities of Northern and Central Italy began to assert themselves.

As Otto III left no sons, his death was followed in Germany by a true election, which gave rise to a contest between various candidates. The victor was Henry II (1002–1024)—elected first as Emperor, and then chosen as German king. He too was a member of the House of Saxony, and a great-grand nephew of Otto the Great. In Italy there was a class conflict, which put forward a local candidate, as in the days of the independent Italic kingdom, and also set in motion the indigenous forces of which we have just been speaking. The lay *signori*, naturally opposed to the policy of the “Ottoni,” which unduly favoured the bishops, elected as their king Arduin, Marquis of Ivrea (1002), who had already, under Otto III, been involved in conflicts with the neighbouring bishops, and had obtained support from the *secundi milites*. The bishops of the Italic kingdom, and with them the Marquises of Canossa—powerful feudatories in league with the German party—were opposed to the new king. They appealed to

Henry II, who in 1004 descended into Italy and was crowned at Pavia: on which occasion he had to suppress a revolt of the citizens. Confronted with the preponderant strength of the German king, Arduin withdrew to his own domains. When Henry had gone he once more exercised the functions of royalty, but was unable to overcome the Germano-episcopal party. When Henry made a second appearance (1013-1014), Arduin did not offer resistance, but after his departure he took up arms again, with some initial success, which was followed by defeat. Falling ill, he retired to the monastery of Fruttuaria (Ivrea), where he died in December 1015. His faction still held out for a time.

During Henry's second descent into the peninsula he proceeded from Northern Italy to Rome, ruled since the death of Otto III by Giovanni Crescenzo, son of the Crescenzo whom Otto had sent to his death, and then by the Counts of Tusculum, who had raised a member of their family to the pontificate: Benedict VIII (1012-1024). Henry II, on arriving in Rome, acknowledged Benedict and was crowned Emperor by him (1014). He had to suppress a revolt of the Roman people, after which he returned to Germany. Benedict VIII acted with energy, not only in ecclesiastical matters, but also in the temporal sphere; in particular, he resumed the struggle against the Musulmans, obtaining support from two cities of the Italic kingdom—Genoa and Pisa—which were then beginning to make their power felt at sea, sending their forces into Corsica and Sardinia.

At the same time there was a native reaction in the south, especially in Apulia, against the Greek domination. In 1009 a revolt, headed by Melo, a noble of Lombard race, spread from Bari throughout almost the whole of Apulia; but the princes of Benevento and Salerno joined the Greek catapan—apparently in order to suppress an autonomous movement in the cities of Apulia, which would have been opposed to their own power—and the revolt was stifled. Melo appealed for assistance to the pontiff, who by reason of his ecclesiastical interests was the natural enemy of the Greek dominion in Southern Italy; and the Pope procured for him the support of certain groups of Norman mercenaries. With them Melo attempted to rebel against the Greeks, but after a few victories he was finally defeated at Canna (1018). Capua and Salerno then acknowledged the Greek suzerainty.

Henry II, incited by Melo, who had taken refuge in Germany (where he died), and by the Pope, entered Italy for the third time (1021), and after subduing Campania made his way into Benevento. But his offensive spent itself in vain against the Greek fortresses of Apulia, and his army was disabled by dysentery, so that he was compelled to withdraw. Pope and Emperor then held a synod in Pavia, which adopted certain measures of ecclesiastical reform; after which he returned to Germany. He had made his power felt in Italy more fitfully than had the three Ottos, and he had met with greater resistance than they had encountered.

The same thing happened under his successor, Conrad II (1024-1039), the first of the Franconian or Salic dynasty which for a century remained on the German throne. The Italian ecclesiastical party, which favoured Conrad, and which was led by the powerful Archbishop of Milan, Heribert d'Intimiano, was opposed by a secular party which appealed in the first place to Robert, King of France, and then to William V, Duke of Aquitaine, who accepted the crown of Italy for his son; but then, not daring to rebel against the bishops, he quitted the field. In this contest Pavia was opposed to Conrad, owing to its rivalry with Milan, which, led by the archbishop, had favoured him. Conrad, on entering Italy, was crowned king in Milan, after which he secured the submission of Pavia and the hostile lay feudatories, among whom was the Marquis of Tuscany, and in Rome he received the imperial crown (1027) from Pope John XIX, the brother of Benedict VIII. Once again a quarrel broke out in Rome between the Romans and the Germans.

Although borne to power in Italy by the ecclesiastical party, Conrad II did not depend on the support of the bishops to the extent that the House of Saxony had done; but as against the great lay and ecclesiastical nobles he sought to reinforce the royal power by other elements. Among these were the *secundi milites*, or minor *valvassori* (called also *vavassori* or *vavasors* simply), who were struggling against the great *signori*, mainly in order to secure the heritability of their own fiefs. Conrad endeavoured to attach them to himself, laying stress upon the principle that for them fealty to the king must take precedence of fealty to their immediate lord.

The struggle between the great feudatories and the vavasors was particularly acute in Lombardy. Archbishop Heribert of Milan attempted to assert his power against his vavasors, and he deprived some of them of their fiefs. At this the whole class of vavasors took up arms; but Heribert secured the support not only of the great vavasors or *capitani*, but also of the urban middle classes, and succeeded in driving his enemies out of the city. The exiles, with the vavasors of the surrounding country, formed a league or *motta* (deriving, perhaps, from the same root as *ammutinamento* = revolt, sedition, meeting). A battle was fought at Campomalo, between Pavia and Abbiate-grasso, and Heribert was compelled to retire into the city of Milan.

Both parties appealed to Conrad II, who entered Italy (1036), and in a diet which was held in Pavia he condemned Heribert, with whom he had already been in dispute, and imprisoned him. The archbishop succeeded in escaping to Milan, which rose as one man in his support. Conrad laid siege to the city, and Heribert, to resist him, raised armed bands from among the people, giving them as their standard the *carroccio*, a car drawn by oxen, above which a banner was displayed. Conrad II failed to subdue the city, while his deposition of Heribert, and his nomination of a successor, were without effect. However, the struggle had one important result: for on this occasion (1037) Conrad promulgated new laws in which all fiefs were declared hereditary in the male line, including those of the vavasors, while it was decreed that no one could be deprived of his fief save by the formal judgement of his peers, against which appeal could be made to the Emperor. By these laws the great feudal magnates lost much of their power, and were exposed to a process of dissolution, while the subordinate class of feudatories were encouraged to transform themselves into small independent landowners.

Henry III (1039-1056), who succeeded to his father at the age of twenty-two, was far more attached to the clergy than Conrad had been, and he showed this immediately by seeking reconciliation with Heribert. But Heribert was now meeting with opposition from the very class which had been his chief support under Conrad: namely, the urban middle class, engaged in trade and industry. The Milanese people took up arms against Heribert and the other nobles, and

compelled them to leave the city (1040). The leader of the *popolari*, Lanzzone, was himself a noble; for a process of fusion had set in between the lesser nobility and the *borghesia*. The archbishop and the nobles subjected Milan to a blockade which continued for three years. The Milanese finally sought aid from Henry, who proposed to send a German garrison to occupy the city and restore order; but the contending parties preferred to come to an agreement, of which we do not know the precise terms, and the exiles returned to the city. From the understanding arrived at between the various social elements there developed later the "commune" of Milan.

While the commune was germinating in Lombardy, the South of Italy was making for the constitution of a single kingdom, thanks to the Norman adventurers who were organizing under their command the local forces which we have already seen in action.

Conrad II, in his second Italian expedition, after breaking off the siege of Milan, had turned his attention to Southern Italy, which was then in a state of extreme confusion. The Greeks were at war with the Lombard princes, and these were fighting the Greeks and the Duchy of Naples; while Norman bands were taking part in all these conflicts, in the service of the various contestants, and were beginning to acquire territorial lordships. Thus, the Norman Rainulf, who had already assisted Melo in his war against the Greeks, obtained from the Duke of Naples the territory of Aversa, which he made into a county (1030). Aversa became a centre of afflux for the Norman bands, while other bands, under the three brothers William, Drogo and Humphrey d'Hauteville, were enrolled by Guaimar IV of Salerno.

Conrad II, when the monks of the abbey of Monte Cassino appealed for his aid against Pandulph IV of Capua, who was also threatening the Roman Campagna, took Capua and invested Guimar with the city (1038), while he acknowledged Rainulf's county of Aversa as a fief of Guaimar's. This was the extent of his activities in the south, for one of the usual epidemics compelled him to withdraw northwards, and he died soon afterwards. The Normans continued to intervene in the local conflicts, and to acquire territory of their own. Brought into Apulia by the native insurgents, in order to fight the Greeks, they confiscated the conquered territory and divided it among themselves.

Rainulf of Aversa took Siponto and Monte Gargano; William d'Hauteville, known as Braccio di Ferro (Bras de fer), became Count of Apulia, with Melfi as his capital, under the overlordship of Guaimar. An expedition under Henry III (1047) recognized the positions acquired by the Normans, and made the counties of Aversa and Melfi fiefs of the Empire, so that Guaimar was deprived of them. Henry also deprived him of Capua, which he restored to Pandulph. The persistent hostility between Capua and Salerno naturally favoured the further progress of the Normans. While Richard of Aversa threatened Capua, Humphrey d'Hauteville, who had succeeded Drogo (as Drogo had succeeded to William) as Count of Melfi, took possession of Salerno; Robert Guiscard (*guiscardo* = astute), another of the Hauteville brothers, made his way into Calabria. Benevento, to escape the Normans, surrendered itself (1051) to Pope Leo IX.

When the Normans had thus become powerful a coalition was formed against them. Certain of the Apulians, who had already rebelled against the Normans, joined forces with the Greeks; and even the pontiff entered into relations with them. But just at this time the ecclesiastical controversies between Rome and Byzantium ended in a definite rupture with the schism of Michael Cerularius (1054). However, Leo IX managed to get a scratch army together, with which he advanced upon the Normans; but at Civita, on the frontier between the Duchy of Benevento and Apulia, his forces were completely defeated by Richard of Aversa and Robert Guiscard (18 June 1053), and the Pope himself was taken prisoner. It was some months before he was liberated. Robert Guiscard, who had succeeded to Humphrey (1057), continued his career of conquest, with the aid of his brother Roger, assuming the title of Duke of Apulia and Calabria, while Richard of Aversa took possession of Capua. Robert continued his victorious campaign, which ended with the total expulsion of the Greeks from the mainland: Bari being occupied in 1071. Calabria having been conquered and divided between himself and his brother Count Roger, the latter, with Robert's assistance, entered upon the conquest of Sicily (Palermo being captured in 1072). He took for himself almost the whole island, which he held under the overlordship of Robert.



§ 33. THE ECCLESIASTICAL REFORMS AND THE WAR OF INVESTITURES.—While civic autonomy was making its first appearance in Upper Italy, and while in the south a single government was replacing the multiplicity of local states, subject to the rule or interference of the two Empires, in Rome the power of the Romano-Germanic Empire seemed to be consolidating itself, thanks to the intervention of Henry III and the consequent reformation of the Papacy. Nevertheless, this intervention, undertaken from a religious motive, contributed to the development of forces which were prejudicial both to the imperial power and to ecclesiastical feudalism, and beneficial to the Papacy. They led to a state of affairs which favoured both the development of communal autonomy, and the definitive formation of the Norman state.

Pope John XIX, who had thought only of the interests of his house of Tusculum, was followed (1032) by his juvenile nephew Benedict IX, who was created Pope—it is said—when only some twelve years of age. The opposition party, led by the Crescenzi, accused him, with reason, of wicked and scandalous behaviour. Benedict, however, had a close understanding with Conrad II (1038), the natural protector of the imperialistic house of Tusculum. Nevertheless, in 1044 a revolt expelled him from the Papacy, and Sylvester III (1045) was elected in his place; only to make way, almost immediately, for his predecessor. Benedict, however, in view of the violent opposition to his person, sold his office to Gregory VI (1045), a priest renowned for his virtue, who was supported by the zealots of ecclesiastical reform. But when the terms of the bargain became known his legitimacy was disputed. In this situation the Emperor's intervention was invited. In December 1046 Henry III convoked at Sutri a Council which deposed both Sylvester and Gregory. But immediately afterwards Benedict who was deposed by a synod assembled in Rome, and at Henry's instance a German bishop, Clement II, was elected (1046–1047). By Clement Henry III was crowned Emperor, and the Romans entered into a pact which conferred upon him the dignity of *patricius romanorum*, with the right of proposing future Popes for election by the clergy and the people. This procedure resulted in the election of three successive

German Popes: Damasius II (1048), Leo IX (1049–1054) and Victor II (1055–1057).

In his nominations Henry III was guided by his sincere desire for the religious restoration of the Papacy and his interest in the cause of ecclesiastical reform, which was espoused by the new series of pontiffs. The reformist movement had originated in the 10th century in the monastery of Cluny in Burgundy (founded in 910), which had formed a special branch of Benedictine monasticism by the foundation of monasteries dependent upon it. The beginning of the 11th century, when the great Odilon was abbot (994–1049), marked the culmination of the Cluniac influence, which made itself felt even in Italy and Rome. Thus, apart from the Greek monasticism of St. Nilus (§ 29), there were two groups of reformed Benedictines: the Camaldolesi, founded in 1012 by St. Romuald in the cloister of Camaldoli, near Arezzo, and the Vallombrosians, founded about 1038 by St. John Gualbert in the cloister of Vallombrosa, near Florence. Both these communities were fervent advocates of ecclesiastical reform.

In its early stages the movement of reform kept within the limits of monasticism, which it hoped to lead back to its original purity, and to the observance of the Benedictine Rule. But even this programme became involved with questions of lay and ecclesiastical politics, for it included the removal of the monasteries from episcopal control, with their immediate subordination to the pontiff, and the defence of monastic property against the lay *signori*: that is, in both its branches it rebelled against the power of feudalism. As time went on the reform movement endeavoured to restore discipline throughout the Church, and to liberate it from secular influence. To this end it waged war against simony (the prevalent abuse, of which kings and secular magnates were guilty, of conferring ecclesiastical offices in return for material payment), and against the marriage, or—as the reformers called it—the concubinage of the clergy. Marriage had been forbidden to the clergy since the 4th century (irrespective of the position in the East), but in actual fact it was very general.

The war upon simony could easily be transformed into a conflict with the royal power, which disposed of the high ecclesiastical dignities, and was very largely based on the subordination of the other

ecclesiastical feudatories. For some time, however, the conflict remained latent; owing in some degree to the fact that Henry III, who was deeply religious, and in close relations with Hugh of Cluny, abstained from simony and regarded the reform of the Church as one of his most urgent tasks. The pontiffs whom he created resumed with redoubled energy the struggle against simony, which was condemned by many Councils; Leo IX being especially active in the cause of reform. Placing the pontificate at the head of the reformist movement, he consolidated the power of the Papacy by insisting on closer relations between the various Churches and Rome, and although he remained on good terms with Henry III he was chiefly concerned with ecclesiastical and Papal interests.

The reformist movement had continued to enlarge its programme; now its more ardent supporters regarded as simony the mere act of investiture by a layman; and they were beginning to consider that the fact that the Papal throne was at the Emperor's disposal was an encroachment upon ecclesiastical liberty. The premature death of Henry III and the minority of his son, Henry IV (1057-1106), contributed to the realization of the reformist programme.

Hildebrand, born at Soana in Tuscany and educated in the Cluniac convent of Santa Maria on the Aventine (in Rome), now became the head of the reformist party in Rome and of the movement in favour of Papal independence. It is doubtful whether he actually took the full monastic vows. He was made cardinal by Leo IX, and under the following pontificates he acquired an ever-increasing influence in the Curia. On the death of Victor II a prelate of a house hostile to the Empire, Frederick, abbot of Monte Cassino, the brother of Godfrey of Lorraine, was elected Pope without nomination by the Emperor (though he afterwards asked the German regency to approve the election). He took the name of Stephen IX (1057-1058). On his death there was a reaction on the part of the Roman nobility, who elected and enthroned Benedict X. Hildebrand, with the consent of the German regency, procured the election in Siena of Gerard, Bishop of Florence (Nicholas II, 1058-1061). Thereupon Godfrey of Lorraine, who had married Beatrice, the widow of Boniface of Canossa, Marquis of Tuscany, and was now administrator of the marquisate, marched upon

Rome and placed Nicholas on the throne. A Lateran Synod (April 1059) issued a decree by which it was established that the election of the Pope must thereafter take place in the College of Cardinals only, with the simple approbation of the clergy and the people. The right of intervention was reserved to King Henry and such of his successors as should obtain it in person; but in actual fact the pontifical election was now liberated from the imperial authority.

It was at this time that the College of Cardinals assumed importance as the principal organ of Papal government. Originally those ecclesiastics were known as cardinals who constituted the organic centre of the episcopal church (from *cardo*, *cardine*, pivot, or principal thing), and hence the "college" which assisted the bishop. In Rome this college consisted of (a) the cardinal priests who were in charge of the various parochial churches (*tituli*) of the city; (b) the cardinal deacons who officiated as deacons in the seven ecclesiastical regions into which Rome was divided (the deaconate, which made its appearance in the earliest Christian times, was an ecclesiastical grade which ranked immediately after that of priest, and whose duties were restricted, in the beginning, to beneficence and devotional services); and (c) the cardinal bishops, or bishops of the so-called suburbicarian dioceses (those nearest the city)—Albano, Frascati, etc. This division of the College subsists even to this day, although in actual practice the original functions of the first two categories have lapsed, so that the latter can be filled by bishops of dioceses remote from the metropolis.

In the same synod of 1059 measures were adopted against the concubinate of the clergy, and it was decreed that no one could receive the incumbency of a church from lay hands. These radical enactments met with open opposition in Germany and Italy; but the pontificate had taken care to secure powerful allies in the Marquises of Tuscany and the Normans.

Nicholas II, at the Council of Melfi (1059), overriding the rights of the Empire, and usurping its place, recognized Robert Guiscard as Duke of Apulia and Calabria and future Duke of Sicily, and Richard of Aversa as Prince of Capua. In return, the two Norman princes swore fealty to the pontiff—who had made himself the dispenser of kingdoms by virtue of his supreme ecclesiastical authority, or in the

name of the Donation of Constantine (§ 24)—pledging themselves to pay an annual rent for the Papal patrimonies occupied, to safeguard the rights and possessions of the Church, and to support the application of the new rules in all future Papal elections. Besides the alliance with the Normans in the south, Papal Rome contracted another alliance with certain popular movements in Lombardy, which combined religious zeal with the urban reaction against the ecclesiastical feudality, and with social movements of whose character we have very little knowledge. Certain bishops were driven from their sees, while simoniacal and married priests were subjected to persecution. The centre of this revolution, which was agitating the whole of Northern Italy, was Milan, where a party hostile to married and simoniacal priests was formed, known by its adversaries as the party of the *paterini* (from *patarius*, old-clothes man, signifying its plebeian origin). The leaders of this party were Anselm, afterwards Bishop of Lucca and Pope, Arialdo, and the brothers Landolfo and Erlembaldo. Archbishop Guido, excommunicated by the Pope, was expelled from the city; he resigned the archbishopric in favour of one Godfrey of Castiglione, who afterwards endeavoured to restore it to Guido, so that he too was attacked by the *paterini*. Milan, becoming accustomed to govern itself without an archbishop, achieved a complete autonomy. Generally speaking, the conflicts which henceforth occurred in the cities of Upper Italy between reformist bishops nominated by the Pope and anti-reformist bishops nominated by the Empire contributed enormously to the growth of civic liberty, whichever party the citizens happened to support.

On the death of Nicholas II Hildebrand procured the election of Anselm Bishop of Lucca, who took the name of Alexander II, enthroning him with the help of the Normans of Capua. The Roman nobles, on the other hand, allied themselves with the Lombard episcopate and the German Court, and the outcome of this alliance was the election of Bishop Cadalus of Parma (Honorius II). But the German regency very quickly abandoned the cause of Honorius, and in the synod of Mantua, which it convoked, Alexander II was acknowledged Pope (1064). He continued the reformist policy, repeatedly asserting his authority over the German episcopate, and he excommuni-

cated the councillors of Henry IV when the king induced the Archbishop of Milan to consecrate a priest suspected of simony.

On the death of Alexander II the clergy and people of Rome, disregarding the provisions of the decree of 1059, acclaimed Cardinal Hildebrand as Pope. Hildebrand took the name of Gregory VII (1073–1085), thereby implying that he considered the deposition of Gregory VI on the initiative of the Empire to have been unlawful. The new pontiff's ideas represented the extreme development of the tendencies already manifested in the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals and the policy of Nicholas I (§ 28). According to Gregory VII the Pope was the supreme and absolute head of the universal Church, with powers to appoint and depose the bishops, and uniquely authorized to convoke General Councils. The more important affairs of the other Churches must be submitted to him, and his decisions were inviolable and admitted of no appeal. Even outside the ecclesiastical hierarchy he was the highest authority on earth, the judge of all, to be judged by none; and it was in his power to depose emperors and kings. For Gregory VII these ideas were not merely theoretical assertions. He intervened actively in episcopal elections, supervising and approving the election of bishops by the clergy and the people, sometimes nominating candidates, and even annulling elections. He frequently exercised his power of deposing unworthy bishops, effecting an extensive expurgation of the episcopate. For such purposes he made frequent use of Papal legates, whom he invested with plenary powers over the local churches, so that they constituted an instrument of centralization. In his relations with reigning sovereigns, he endeavoured to establish, in as many cases as possible, a feudal bond of vassalage to the Holy See. And this he succeeded in doing not only in the case of Robert Guiscard in Southern Italy, but also in that of the kings of Spain, Hungary, Serbia, Croatia, etc.

In the synod held in Lent, 1074, Gregory VII declared that all simoniacs were divested of any rights over their churches, and he deprived both them and the *concubinari* (married priests) of their priestly functions, incited their flocks to break off all relations with them, and sent out legates to see that these orders were obeyed. Next year, in the same synod, besides excommunicating certain councillors

of Henry's who were instigators to simony, he took the decisive step of declaring any bestowal of ecclesiastical office by a layman to be illegal: which would have resulted in depriving the royal power in Germany and Italy of a great proportion of the superior feudatories. However, Gregory did not immediately publish the decree, and made it evident that he was disposed to come to an understanding with the king; but Henry went his way, appointing several bishops, and among them the Bishop of Milan, when the power of the *pataria* was overthrown. The Pope then sent an ultimatum to the king, threatening him with excommunication and deposition (December 1075). Henry IV and the German and Lombard bishops responded by declaring that Hildebrand was no lawful Pope (January 1076); whereupon Gregory, in the Roman synod of February 1076, excommunicated and deposed the king, absolving his subjects from their oath of fealty and forbidding them to obey him. This was the first time that the Pope arrogated to himself the right to depose a sovereign.

The aristocratic opposition to Henry which had already formed in Germany allied itself with the Pope; and a Diet of German princes decided that they would no longer acknowledge the king unless he was assailed of excommunication within a year. Henry parried the blow, obtaining absolution from Gregory VII by the famous humiliation of Canossa (January 1077). Nevertheless, his German enemies did not lay down their arms; on the contrary, they even elected Rudolf Duke of Swabia in his place (March 1077). A civil war followed, in which Gregory did not intervene until 1080, when he once more excommunicated and deposed Henry, conferring the crown upon Rudolf. Henry replied by nominating Guibert of Ravenna Antipope (June 1080) in the synod of Bressanone; and shortly afterwards, his rival Rudolf having fallen in battle, he entered Italy, where, his partisans having defeated the Countess Matilda, the road lay open to Rome, to which he laid siege. After three years, the Roman populace having dethroned the pontiff, Henry IV succeeded in entering the city, where he enthroned Clement III, who crowned him emperor. Gregory VII, shut up in Castel Sant' Angelo, invoked the aid of Robert Guiscard, whose investiture he had renewed after a temporary quarrel, and Robert, fearful of the consequences of an imperial victory, marched

upon Rome. Henry and Clement withdrew from the city, and the Normans, having entered, massacred the inhabitants. Amidst the curses of the populace Gregory VII also left Rome, following Guiscard and taking refuge in Salerno, where he died on the 25 May 1085, uttering the famous words—quite possibly with entire conviction: “I have loved justice and hated iniquity, wherefore I die in exile.”

In Rome, where the Antipope, returning, ascended the Papal throne, the Imperial and Gregorian parties engaged in ferocious conflict. In Germany Henry was now master of the situation, but in Upper Italy Matilda of Canossa was in rebellion against him, while various Lombard cities (Milan, Piacenza, etc.) joined themselves for the first time in league against the Emperor, proclaiming Conrad (1093) king: Henry's eldest son, who had rebelled against his father. Not all the Lombard cities, however, were opposed to Henry: some took his part, rebelling against the authority of Matilda. Henry succeeded in triumphing over his son's rebellion, but he failed to establish his dominion over Italy. In 1093 Pope Urban II (1088–1099) re-established himself in Rome, whence the Antipope was expelled in 1097. Urban succeeded in obtaining the support of the majority of the imperial bishops, acknowledging those who had been invested by the king to be guiltless of simony, provided they abandoned the Antipope. In 1100 Clement III died, and the schism was at an end. Henry IV suffered a decisive blow in the rebellion of his second son, Henry, who placed himself at the head of the hostile German faction. The king was taken prisoner by treachery and compelled to abdicate (1105). He succeeded, however, in escaping, and indomitably resumed the struggle, but in August 1106 he died at Liège.

Henry V (1106–1125), now the sole sovereign, continued the conflict against the pontiff. In 1110, descending upon Italy with a great army, he approached almost to the walls of Rome. Pope Pascal II (1099–1118) concluded a pact with him, the Pact of Sutri (February 1111), by the terms of which the Church would have had to restore to the king all the fiefs and privileges received from the kings since the days of Charlemagne, while the king would have renounced the right of investiture. It was the radical solution: a sort of separation between Church and State; but for this reason both clergy and laity joined in



opposing it. The agreement having fallen through, Henry imprisoned the Pope, and obtained from him, together with a pact permitting the free election of prelates, the right of investiture and the Imperial crown (April 1111). But Pascal, on being liberated by the Emperor, had to disavow the concession, which was fiercely attacked by the Gregorian party, confirm the decrees against investitures, and excommunicate Henry V. Now another cause of controversy appeared—the inheritance of the Countess Matilda, who died in 1115. She had bequeathed all her domains to the Church, a disposal which was valid in respect of allodial property, but not in respect of feudal estates, which according to the law of the period had to pass to the relatives of the deceased, or in default of such they reverted to the sovereign. Henry V declared the testament null and void, and took possession of Matilda's estates. This new quarrel increased the anarchy of the Italian kingdom and favoured the cause of civic autonomy.

The War of Investitures was finally settled by Henry V and Calixtus II (1119–1124), who accepted the distinction, formulated more especially by the French theologians, between spiritual and temporal investitures. The Concordat of Worms (23 September 1122)—the first document of the kind—declared that the king renounced the investiture of bishops and abbots, with the giving of the ring and the pastoral staff, but retained the right of investiture with the sceptre; that is, the feudal concession of temporal possessions. In Germany this royal investiture was to precede the consecration of the bishop (so that in practice his enthronement depended on the king's authority), while in Burgundy and Italy it was to follow consecration. In Roman territory, on the other hand, the Emperor renounced all rights of royalty in respect of ecclesiastical dignities and possessions. Elections were to be conducted in canonical form, but in Germany they must occur in the presence of the Emperor or one of his *missi*, with the right of intervention in the case of a double election. Nothing was said in the Concordat respecting the intervention of the Emperor in the election of the Popes. The first Lateran Council of 1123 (the first Oecumenical Council of the West, and the ninth in the series of general Councils of the Roman Church) sanctioned the agreement, and confirmed the condemnation of simony and clerical concubinage.

§ 34. ECCLESIASTICAL CONDITIONS. THE FIRST CRUSADE. CHIVALRY.—Notwithstanding the character of compromise which marked the Concordat of Worms, the Empire emerged from the War of Investitures weaker than before, while the Church, and more especially the pontificate, were strengthened. In the course of the conflict the Pope had been led to interfere in the internal affairs of the various churches of the West, and to proclaim and effectively assert his own supremacy over them. The power of royalty to confer high ecclesiastical dignities having been diminished, there was less danger of the formation of national churches that might have confronted the Pope with a barrier which he could hardly have crossed. Notwithstanding the restoration of the canonical election of bishops by clergy and people, both people and clergy, in the course of the 12th century, lost the power of effective participation in the episcopal elections, which were conducted by the clergy of the episcopal church: that is, by the chapter of the canons of the cathedral, with the ever-increasing intervention of the Roman pontiff.

Both a manifestation and a cause of the enhanced power of the Papacy was the development of canon law, which received a special impulse from the War of Investitures and the flood of polemical literature which accompanied it. About the close of the 11th and the beginning of the 12th century a series of compilations of canon law were made (by Anselm, Bishop of Lucca, Cardinal Deusdedit, and Ivo, Bishop of Chartres), in which the judgement was expressed that the rules of law emanating from the pontiff were superior to all others. This judgement was triumphantly asserted in the middle of the 12th century by the *Concordia discordantium canonum* of the Camaldolese monk Gratianus, a teacher of canon law in Bologna. His codex, which was known more briefly as *Decretum Gratiani*, came to be universally accepted as the standard work on the subject.

In monastic life the most important new formation, initiated during the War of Investitures, was the Order of Cistercians, so called from the convent of Cîteaux or Cistercium in Burgundy, founded in 1098. But the great prosperity of the Order dated from the time of St. Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153), a cloister founded by himself, which became the centre of a great number of other foundations. The

Cistercian monasteries had a common Rule, recognizing the Abbot of Cîteaux as their head, but they were divided into various groups, each looking to the original monastery as its head, but retaining a certain autonomy. In opposition to the more worldly nature of the Cluniac monasticism, the essential ideal of St. Bernard and the Cistercians was the return to the Benedictine life of labour and prayer, in poverty and remoteness from the world and all mundane affairs. The Cistercian foundations, therefore, were established on uncultivated soil, far from any inhabited centre, and the land was cultivated by the monks themselves, under a single management, and by intensive methods, in large agricultural estates, which produced very remarkable results as regards the improvement and colonization of the soil. This work was accomplished more especially beyond the Alps and in Germany; but in Italy also there were some notable examples, such as that of Chiaravalle near Milan. Cistercian monasticism, in its early period, denoted a reaction against feudalism, since the monasteries, by reason of their system of direct exploitation of the soil by the monks and their assistants, and their abstention, on principle, from mundane affairs, wished neither to have vassals nor to exercise feudal jurisdiction. Very soon, however, this special characteristic of the Order disappeared. As their possessions and their privileges increased the Cistercians became assimilated to the surrounding world.

The First Crusade did much to increase the prestige of the Papacy and to confirm its victory over the Empire in the War of Investitures. The expansion of the Seldjukid Turks into Asia Minor compelled the Emperor of the East to appeal for aid to the Western sovereigns and the Popes. Urban II, adopting an idea which had been adumbrated by Gregory VII, conceived the grandiose plan of a Holy War of the entire Christian Occident against the Musulmans, and he preached this war in the Council of Piacenza, and above all in the Council of Clermont (1095). Thousands responded to the appeal with the historic cry of "Dieu le veult," and made a vow to the Pope to go upon an armed pilgrimage to the Holy Land, in order to liberate the sepulchre of Christ. As a token of their vow they wore a cross of red cloth. Extempore preachers, among them the famous Peter the Hermit,

spread the news of the Pope's demand, while the tales which the pilgrims returning from the Holy Land had to tell of the maltreatment inflicted upon them by the Musulmans still further excited the zeal of the Crusaders. This was the origin of the First Crusade, which assembled three hundred thousand men—without a supreme commander, if we except the Papal legate Adhemar of Puy. Among the greater captains, besides Godfrey of Bouillon, Duke of Lower Lorraine, who was then erroneously regarded as the commander-in-chief, were the Normans, Bohemond, the son of Robert Guiscard, and his nephew Tancred. After some trouble with the Byzantines the crusading army crossed into Asia Minor from Constantinople, captured Nicea, defeated the Sultan of Iconium at Dorileo in Phrygia, and conquered Antioch, of which Bohemond was made prince; and finally, enormously reduced in strength by numerous disputes, desertions, and epidemics, it reached the walls of Jerusalem, which the Turks had recently taken from the Fatimids of Egypt, and after a month of siege it entered the city on the 15 July 1099, committing a horrible massacre of the population. The government of the city was conferred upon Godfrey, with the title of Defender of the Holy Sepulchre; his successors took the title of king, and the kingdom of Jerusalem was organized on the feudal pattern, with a series of dependent dominions (Antioch, Edessa, Tripoli, Tyre).

The First Crusade was followed by many others, and we shall have occasion to speak of the more important. (The traditional number of eight is conventional, and indicates only the more noteworthy.) The Crusades were theoretically a religious undertaking, an armed pilgrimage accomplished in obedience to a vow, whose supreme head and organizer was the Pope, who conceded to the crusaders, as to the ordinary pilgrims, the remission of the canonical penances which they had incurred (indulgences). This tremendous movement had various causes. To religious enthusiasm, and the hope of gaining eternal life by fighting and gloriously dying, must be added the bellicose temper of the Middle Ages, the craving for adventure, the existence of great numbers of homeless men who saw in this enterprise a hope of advancement, greed of gain, and the lust of power. More generally speaking, we may see in the Crusades a manifestation of that rebirth of European

activity about the beginning of the 11th century, which, among other results, led to more intensive relations between West and East. To peaceful commercial and cultural relations the Crusades added military expeditions, which in their turn produced a greater activity of exchange of all kinds between East and West.

Italy played a modest part in the Crusades in respect of military expeditions. On the other hand, the Italians co-operated on a much larger scale in the transport of the Crusaders, and all the consequent commercial activity. This aspect of the Crusades was of the greatest importance for the development of the Italian maritime republics (§ 37).

The phenomenon of the Crusades is closely related to another characteristic of the intermediate period between the Early and Late Middle Ages: namely, the institution of chivalry. This emerged from feudal society under the impulse of religious, cultural, and social motives which led to a transformation in the manner of regarding the employment of arms and the functions of the aristocracy.

The laws and ideals of honour common to all nobles made them a society of warriors whose manners and customs were the same in all countries affected by the expansion of feudalism. It had already been a Germanic custom to confer the right of bearing arms upon a warrior by a solemn formality, in the presence of other warriors. The exercise of arms having become a privilege of the nobles, who fought on horseback, the name of *miles*, *eques*, *caballarius* became synonymous with "noble," and the chivalry was the whole body of noble warriors. Since the bearing of arms was the first requisite of the noble's honour, it was obvious that before he could bear arms the candidate must give proof that he was worthy to do so. The young noble had to learn the profession of arms either in his father's castle, or, more frequently, in that of another nobleman, whom he served for a time as esquire and servant. His period of apprenticeship over, at the age of 18 or 20 he was armed knight. The ceremony, simple enough in the beginning, became more solemn and complicated with the lapse of time, the Church intervening to instruct the knight in his religious and moral duties. Then came the "vigil of arms" in church or chapel, confession and communion, the instruction of

the new knight as to his duties, and his oath to be faithful in their performance (probity, fidelity, protection of the Church and the weak and defenceless); lastly, the knight's arms were blessed, and he was invested with them. It was a kind of military baptism, with kinsmen as godfathers. Chivalry established between all those who were members of it, of whatever nationality or degree of nobility, a fraternal bond. All obeyed the same laws, all had the same rights and the same duties. In this fashion the profession of arms and the caste of nobles were moralized and idealized, while the tendency to such abuses of force as violence, rapine and revenge was held in check.

An analogous moderating influence was exercised by the Church in its imposition of the "Truce of God": that is, the suspension, imposed as a duty to the Church, of all warlike actions on certain appointed days, such as Sundays, the days of Lent, or the latter part of the week. However, this never became a general institution: it was restricted rather to a number of local initiatives on the part of the bishops, more especially in France.

Chivalry also was essentially a French institution. Italy, where the development of feudalism was later and less complete, and where it decayed sooner than elsewhere, was of all countries that in which the institution of chivalry flourished least spontaneously and was of least importance. The economic and social evolution of the Middle Ages presently deprived the institution of its *raison d'être*, and in so far as it survived it assumed the aspect of a pathological phenomenon—a sort of indolent and predatory vagabondage, whose consequences were the very contrary of those for which the institution had been consecrated by the Church and the moral conscience of the times.

## CHAPTER VII

### THE COMMUNES AND THE KINGDOM

§35. DECADENCE AND RECOVERY OF THE CITIES.—We have seen that the War of Investitures contributed in various ways, above all in Upper Italy, to increase the autonomy of urban life. The Empire was enfeebled, and the ecclesiastical feudality was seriously undermined. Between the two rival parties the peoples came forward, being now in a position to make their opinion felt, wresting privileges from the bishops, the feudal lords, and the emperors. The great duchies and marquisates were now for the most part in a state of dissolution, beginning with the marquisate of the Canossa family, which was left without heirs. It was during the War of Investitures about 1100, that the greater communes of Upper Italy arose; in some places earlier, in some later.

The vicissitudes suffered by the Italian cities, as juridical entities, administrative organizations, and politico-social forces, during the five hundred years from the end of the Roman *municipia* to the constitution of the communes, have remained to this day extremely obscure, and it is probable that they will always be so, in the absence of adequate documents. There is no doubt that in Italy, about the close of the 6th and the beginning of the 7th century, the Roman *municipia*, which for the last two hundred years had been reduced to a shadowy existence, now disappeared entirely, apart, indeed, from the survival of a few petty officials whose function it was to register documents (*notarii*). This applies to Byzantine Italy, and still more to Lombard Italy, where the Roman population was excluded from the government. We need not, however, believe that the disappearance of the *municipium* meant also that the cities ceased to have any importance, or that they no longer had a life of their own, apart from that of the surrounding countryside. This notion is contradicted by the mere existence of the bishops; they still had their

sees in the cities, whose administration was constituted by the urban clergy. The formation of country parishes, the foundation of privately owned churches and chapels by landowners, and hence by the feudal *signori* in their own domains, and the growth of the monasteries, great and small, many of which were founded outside the cities, although they acquired great significance, did not detract from the importance of the episcopates. Some of the great monasteries, which equalled and even surpassed the episcopates in importance, also assumed the functions of the episcopates in respect of the population of their domains, and they ended by becoming cities. This phenomenon, however, was less frequent in Italy than elsewhere.

Since in the early Middle Ages the ecclesiastical life was far richer in content, and embraced a much wider sphere of activity than it does to-day, the persistence and importance of the episcopal centres was enough to enable the cities to maintain a life and an organization of their own, apart from the strictly religious domain. The election of the bishop itself, in which the clergy, the city magnates, and the people took part, was a manifestation of the administrative life of the city. Moreover, the Lombard dukes and *gastaldi*, who were generally resident in any city properly so called (the episcopal city), helped to give the cities a certain permanent importance; and this was equally true, for some time, of the Frankish counts.

The preponderating importance of territorial property, which continued for some centuries, and the institution of the feudal system, led to an impoverishment of urban life. Industry and commerce being greatly restricted, and becoming to a great extent local, much of the economic activity of the age was centred, as we have seen (§ 20) upon the *corti* or country residences of the great landowners, to which even the artisans of the cities repaired in order to give their services and acquire a fixed habitation. However, this type of domainal economy, which made for the establishment of so many close and self-sufficing centres, never became exclusive: there were still manifestations of economic life in the cities, while the trade with foreign countries, together with the production and exchange of articles not intended for consumption on the spot, never entirely ceased.

The economic loss inflicted upon the cities by the domainal economy



was less serious than the injury to their political and administrative life which resulted from feudalism. The system of immunities, by concentrating power in the hands of the rural landowners, destroyed the public or governmental authority, properly so-called, which should have been exercised in the cities. The urban population, which was still able to participate to a certain extent in the exercise of this authority (as, for example, in the judicial sphere, though the institution of the *scabinato* or provostship: § 26), played no part whatever in the exercise of feudal powers, and became, so to speak, a mere appendage of the great feudal domains.

Even under the feudal system the episcopates were the principal factor making for the continuation of urban life, and preventing the cities from sinking into complete insignificance. The bishops became great feudal lords; and in their case, no less than in that of the lay nobles—and even more, as during the period of the Ottos—the kings and emperors were lavish in the bestowal of sovereign rights. But unlike the lay feudatories, the bishops resided in the cities; and the privileges granted to them by the sovereigns made them, in a greater or less degree, the actual governors of the cities, until in certain cases the true and authentic office and title of count was conferred upon them (§ 31). In the exercise of these functions the bishops—who had at the same time to perform their ecclesiastical duties—were largely assisted by the urban laity. In many cases (as in Milan in the 11th century) a council consisting of the bishop and the notables of the city presided over the despatch of secular business; that is, in effect, it administered the public affairs of the city. Such a council was in many respects a prototype of the consulate of the communes.

In the middle of the 9th century, however, the urban populations of Upper Italy manifested, here and there, symptoms of a persistent or recuperated personality, quite apart from the episcopal power and the power of the counts, and sometimes actually opposed to the bishop in juridical controversies. This personality found expression in the administration of civic property, and took concrete form in a sort of district administrative organization.

In the Carolingian period we note an increase of economic life,

and in particular of commercial activity. Notwithstanding the partial regression due to the wars between rival sovereigns, and the Barbarian invasions, this increase was maintained and accentuated in the following centuries. There was an economic strengthening and a demographic increase of the urban population. The incursions of the Hungarians and Saracens led the cities to restore the ancient walls or to build new ones, within which the population of the surrounding countryside sought refuge. And besides the ancient cities, the castles or fortresses which had been built by the armed forces of this or that realm during the Byzantine-Lombard period now assumed greater importance, and in some cases they were transformed into cities; as indeed were some of the signorial *corti* and feudal castles. The economic revival became general in the 11th century, and in the 12th century it was still further intensified by the Crusades. Economic relations with the Orient had never entirely ceased; and the trade in "spices" (aromatic and medicinal herbs and condiments) had always retained its importance, such goods being imported into Italy through Venice and the other maritime cities, and forwarded to Central Europe *via* the valley of the Po. But now there was an ever-increasing influx from the East—payment being made, for the most part, in gold, unless the goods were merely looted—of manufactured products (silks, carpets, velvets, gold and silver tissues) and raw materials (hemp and flax), the latter helping to establish and nourish new industries in the West. The North of Europe too began to acquire commercial importance: from England, Scandinavia and North-Western Russia raw materials were derived for certain industries (hides and furs), and alimentary products (salt fish), while these countries imported in exchange spices and manufactured goods. These commercial exchanges also were effected very largely *via* the valley of the Po and Venice. From Lombardy the stream of traffic ran across the Brenner to the Germanic countries, or by way of Mont Cenis and the two passes of St. Bernard to France and Burgundy. Side by side with the local markets, which had survived throughout the early Middle Ages, were established the great fairs of national and international importance: for example, the fairs of Champagne, which were celebrated throughout the 12th and 13th

centuries, and which were largely dependent upon the advent of the great Italian merchants.

All this gave rise to an intensive circulation of money, which diminished the importance of landed property, while at the same time it facilitated the buying and selling of land, and the circulation of wealth in general, and also the displacement and fusion of the social classes. Landowners and feudal *signori* in economic difficulties sold their land and their feudal privileges, which were acquired by enriched merchants and manufacturers. Among the factors contributing to the rise of this monetary economy were a number of institutions in respect of which the Italian cities played a preponderant part. Manufacturers and merchants combined in corporations, known in Italy as *arti*, which included all those inhabitants of the city who were engaged in the same trade—masters and apprentices, employers and workmen—and this movement led to the strict regulation of the various economic activities, the exercise of which was the monopoly of the relevant corporation. These *arti* assured their members of protection, defence, and assistance. The question whether there was any sort of continuity between these corporations of the communal period and those of the late Roman Empire may be regarded as answered, once for all, in the negative, although the possibility is not excluded that in some of the Italian cities certain elements of the ancient corporations may have survived to contribute to the formation of the new. These corporations or *arti* owed their multiplication and differentiation to the economic developments of the period, and the social conflicts. Side by side with the greater corporations or *arti maggiori* there arose the lesser guilds or *arti minori*, whose origin was to be explained either by an economic differentiation of functions, or by the fact that the workers engaged in this or that part of the process of production wished to combine in associations of their own, distinct from those of the manufacturers. As time went on there was no lack of disputes between employers and workers in respect of wages.

Besides the industrial organizations and institutions there were others which were more specifically commercial. The merchants formed associations whose function was to protect their members

and prevent competition; and these societies were afterwards transformed—in Italy earlier than elsewhere—into companies whose capital was invested in some common undertaking, the profits being divided in proportion to the capital holding. Many accessory organizations and institutions arose, which have survived to the present day: warehouses in which goods were kept on deposit; branch establishments representing the central society; banks which changed the various currencies, received money on deposit, and issued loans; and bills of exchange by which payments could be made without the actual transmission of coin.

§ 36. THE FORMATION OF THE COMMUNE AND ITS INSTITUTIONS.—In the cities, now more densely populated and in every way stronger, the merchants and manufacturers were not the only social elements. Other citizens of great importance were the small landowners and the *secundi milites* (§ 32), who resided in the city although they possessed their small estates or fiefs in the country, and it was not an unknown thing for these landowners to engage in some branch of industry or commerce. Even the employers of the episcopal administration of the city, the bishop's officials and representatives (viscounts, advocates, etc.) might belong to this category. This admixture of various elements is especially notable in the formation of the Italian communes, while in the transalpine communes (in the South of France, and Flanders, and the Rhine valley) the industrial and commercial element assumed a great preponderance. These various elements, mutually balanced and assimilated in the life of the urban commune, contributed to the formation of the new Italian people, which after centuries of subjection once more began to make history. Of course, it must not be supposed that the native Italian population played no part whatever in political life, even during the Lombard period, or at all events in its latter part, and still less during the Frankish period and the feudal era. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the Lombard and Frankish conquerors were foreign peoples, who retained, long after their settlement in Italy, a separate national consciousness. We have only to recall the rigid line drawn by the historian Luitprand (who was a

bishop, and not a lay *signore*), in the middle of the 10th century, between the Germanic elements settled in Italy and the Roman people, which he regarded as definitely inferior. The feudal, governing lay aristocracy was Lombard, Frankish, Saxon or Swabian; and a great proportion of the ecclesiastical aristocracy was of alien blood. In the higher ranks of the aristocracy the Franks were predominant; the Lombard elements were found more especially in the middle and lesser nobility. About the end of the 9th century Lombards and Romans were lumped together under the denomination of "Italians," in contradistinction to the Germans or Teutons, who continued to represent the foreign and ruling element *par excellence*. With the revival of the cities and the formation of the communes this foreign aristocracy, although it did not disappear, lost its predominant position; while in the cities, and thanks to them—but also, as we shall presently see, in the rural communes—the Italian nation came to the top again, finally assimilating the foreign elements, and becoming once more master in its own house. The particularism of the communes was not a disintegration but a reconstitution of national autonomy.

The commune properly so called, therefore, included the various elements of the population which had acquired a predominating position, and were able to influence the administration of the city entering into associations that promoted their collective interests, independently of the ruler or rulers of the city. The commune arose as a private association, but to a certain extent, by its very constitution, it took over the administration of the city, and thus became a public entity. In the beginning it did not suppress the episcopal, comital or feudal authorities, but took its place beside them, competing with them, restricting their action, and opposing them, and it tended to eliminate them, by subtracting from them an ever-increasing number of persons and functions, and by endeavouring to subject to its own authority all the inhabitants of the city and the surrounding territory. In this decisive period—which for the communes of Upper Italy may be placed, as we have seen, at the close of the 11th century—the urban population entered into direct conflict with the bishop, though at an earlier period their relations had been marked by the greatest harmony.

By seeking to assert its authority over all the commune to some extent restored the unitary authority of the State, which had been largely destroyed in the period of the Barbarian invasions, and still more effectively in the feudal period. It had not yet become the modern State, rigidly unitarian and strictly centralized; but there was an end of the medley of jurisdictions, privileges, authorities and exemptions, the complex of classes and groups, the confusions of public and private law, of property and sovereignty, which characterized the feudal age. Those who speak of communal subdivision or disassociation are thinking too exclusively of superficial unity, and are disregarding—so to speak—the vertical section. The very word “commune” (*commune* = common, general, public) signifies the unitary bond which holds together, under an authority and under laws acknowledged by all, the different social elements which had previously governed themselves in accordance with different statutes, had applied different laws, and appealed to different jurisdictions.

This was a maximum programme, which took shape only in the course of time; it was never completely realized, inasmuch as the privileged classes never completely disappeared. The life of the commune might be described as a continual struggle, mainly against the feudality, but also against the ecclesiastical privileges of the bishop's court and immunity from taxation. The feudatories living outside the city were compelled to swear fealty to it, to surrender land to it, and to take up their residence within the walls. In the conflicts with the bishop the ecclesiastical excommunication was countered by the lay interdict or boycott; that is, the communal authorities would forbid the citizens all intercourse with the episcopate.

While the commune endeavoured to assert its supreme authority as against the lay and ecclesiastical authorities of the city, it did not for this reason lay claim to complete autonomy, to what we should call to-day the absolute sovereignty of the State (a concept unknown in the Middle Ages), or, to put it more plainly, to independence of any superior authority. In Italy the communes acknowledged the sovereignty of the Emperor and King of Italy. One might say that the commune assumed the position of the great vassal in its relations

with the sovereign; like the great feudatory, it liberated itself more or less, as time and place permitted, from its obligations (military service, various imposts and prestations, acknowledgement of the supreme jurisdiction of the crown). This liberation was greater in Italy than in the transalpine communes; and some of the great Italian communes, in extending their rule over neighbouring cities and rural districts, were really laying the foundations of modern States. And in the country districts a movement analogous to that which was transforming the walled cities was making itself felt: the centres of rural population were forming autonomous organizations, independent of the feudal authorities. Here too the prime foundations were ancient; for by the side of the Roman city there was the *pagus* (§ 5), which found its analogy and its continuation in the rural parish. The inhabitants of the parish were accustomed to assemble for the discussion of their affairs in the open space before the church; and this meeting might include the representatives of several parishes, just as in the old days the representative of a number of *pagi* would assemble in the *conciliabula* and *fora* (§ 8). The merchants also took part in these assemblies. Sometimes the garrisons of Lombard *arimanni* (§ 23) formed the nuclei of the later rural associations. The signorial castle itself became an instrument of organization and emancipation, for the feudal lord called upon the surrounding inhabitants to defend it, granting in return concessions of land or privileges. In this way the *castra* came into existence, of which we are reminded even to this day by many Italian place-names. The rural commune was substantially an association of cultivators whose function was to protect them and liberate them from the bonds of feudal servitude. Among its members were small landowners who were also freemen (*allodiali*), feudatories of the lowest grade, and above all colonists who had succeeded in liberating themselves from servitude and from their feudal obligations: if not by abolishing them altogether, yet by replacing them by payments in kind and prestations of labour, or a fixed money payment. The record of this process of enfranchisement, a movement of the greatest importance, is preserved in many Italian place-names: as Francavilla, Castelfranco, Bergofranco, Villanova, etc. More than once the communes themselves (and even sovereigns and great *signori*)

instituted places of refuge in which the slaves of the surrounding region could make their home, becoming, as they did so, freemen.

It is usual to speak of the commune as a democratic institution: and so it was from the beginning if we compare it (as is only reasonable) with the political and social order which preceded it. This does not mean, however, that in the beginning all the inhabitants of the city took part in the discussion and despatch of public affairs. In the early commune the administration of public affairs was assumed by a minority of citizens, distinguished by birth, or social position, or wealth. It consisted essentially of the members of the urban nobility (that is, mainly of the lesser nobility) and of the upper middle class, or, as they were called, the *popolo grasso*. Nevertheless, there were not lacking representatives of the old defeated classes, such as viscounts, episcopal councillors, and representatives of the Empire. The *popolo grasso* soon got the upper hand, constituting a new aristocracy, which often possessed not only monetary wealth, but also landed property, so that in every respect it took the place of the old nobility. It was only at a later period that the *popolo minuto* appeared on the scene: by which we mean the class of artisans rather than the proletariat in the modern sense of the word. The struggle for participation in the government of the city (to-day we should say for the extension of political rights) became one of the fundamental factors of communal life. These rights were demanded and obtained not by individuals, but by the various collectivities or castes: for here a whole body of guilds or corporations were seeking to assert their common rights. Besides the economic corporations or *compagnie di arti* there were the *compagnie di armi*, the military organizations, based, for the most part, on the division of the city into wards or quarters, in which the citizens were united under suitable leaders for the purpose of maintaining public order; or, when necessary, they took the field against external enemies. In this military expedition the citizen soldiers of the communes of Northern Italy rallied round the *carroccio* (§ 32). The noble families also were organized in associations known as *consorterie*.

The supreme organ of the public life of the commune was the assembly of all those citizens who were in enjoyment of political



rights; an assembly which was known as *parlamento*, *concione*, *arengo*. It elected the magistrates, approved the communal statutes, and deliberated over the question of peace or war. For deliberations on current affairs there were special councils of a more restricted character, such as the *consiglio di credenza*, which assisted the civic magistrates with its advice. These magistrates exercised the ordinary executive, administrative and judicial powers, and led the citizen forces into the field. It became usual to speak of them as *consoli*, obviously in reminiscence of the Roman consuls, just as the memories of ancient Rome and the consciousness that the Italians and the descendants of the Roman people were active elements in the rebirth of Italian nationality and the civic consciousness of the commune. There were consuls in Pavia as early as 1084, in Milan in 1097, in Como in 1109, in Bologna in 1123, in Piacenza in 1126. Sometimes they were elected not by the *parlamento*, but by drawing lots; while certain corporations had a right to be represented in the governing magistrature.

§ 37. THE COMMUNES IN CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN ITALY. VENICE—Generally speaking, the communes developed sooner in Upper than in Central Italy. In Tuscany we may say that the commune, which during the lifetime of the Countess Matilda was in a state of incubation, underwent a decisive development after her death. As early as 1125 Florence asserted its autonomy by making war upon Fiesole, which had been the more powerful city in Roman days, and subjecting it. We find consuls in Florence in 1138; but they appeared much earlier in Lucca—in 1084: that is, in the city which had for centuries been the capital of the Tuscan marquisate, and which was, for this reason, of preponderant importance.

In the same year we find consuls in Pisa; but here the communal institutions were much more precocious, and to a certain extent they developed in a different direction, as in Genoa, owing to the maritime activities of the two cities. The commerce in which they engaged at an early period, their naval conflicts with the Saracens, and their general maritime activities naturally drew these two cities out of the framework of the feudal institutions and favoured an early development of civic institutions—a development which was sanctioned by

signorial and imperial privileges. We have seen that in the days of Henry II—that is, at the beginning of the 11th century—the two cities had already united against the Saracens. These conflicts filled a very great part of the early history of Genoa and Pisa, which is enshrined—especially in the case of Pisa—in a number of legends, the most remarkable of which relates the episode of Cinzica dei Sismondi, the lady who is supposed to have captained the men of Pisa in a victorious attack upon the Saracens. That the Saracens repeatedly made assaults upon the city at the beginning of the 11th century is a fact. The Genoese-Pisan league defeated the Musulman chieftain Spagna Musa or Musetto, who had conquered the Balearics and Sardinia (1016), thereby acquiring supremacy over the Tyrrhenean Sea. Afterwards, however, the two cities fought for the possession of Corsica and Sardinia. By the peace of 1087 Corsica fell to Genoa and Sardinia to Pisa. In Sardinia, under Pisan suzerainty, four judicatures were constituted, the government of which was the hereditary function of certain noble Pisan families.

These two maritime cities emerged, though not altogether in identical ways, from the feudal world of the Italian kingdom. The other maritime republics of Italy were in a different case, for they did not pass through the phase of feudal organization. The most notable example is that of Venice. For a long while Venice was in formal dependence on Byzantium, her *dogi* receiving from the emperors of Constantinople dignities which made them, nominally, high officers of the Empire. This dependence, however, was purely formal, and left Venice free to conclude agreements with the emperors and the kings of Italy, thereby obtaining commercial privileges over and above those conceded by Byzantium. The principal characteristic of Venice was precisely the fact of constituting a bridge between East and West, which was one of the chief means of communication between Italy and the world of the Eastern Mediterranean and the Balkans. The commercial expansion of Venice was in the strictest relation to her development as a naval power and her territorial acquisitions. Her chief aim was dominion over the Adriatic, which meant dominion over the Istrian and Dalmatian coasts. A beginning was made with the conquest of Istria as early as the first half of the

9th century; while the Doge Pietro Orseolo II (991–1009) established the supremacy of Venice over the Dalmatian cities, which had appealed to him to defend them against the assaults of the Croats, the Byzantine Emperor, their nominal sovereign, being incapable of protecting them.

A phenomenon which characterized the internal life of Venice in the last centuries of the early Middle Ages was the replacement of the old aristocracy by tribunes, district leaders (§ 23), who were members of the new commercial aristocracy. Venice had no experience of feudalism. This development was complicated by the conflict between the power of the Doges, which was tending to become hereditary, and that of the aristocracy itself. The Particiaco, the Candiano, the Orseolo formed a sort of local dynasties, thanks to the custom, introduced by the Doges, of governing in association with a son. With the fall of the Orseolo (1026) the aristocracy began to get the upper hand of the monarchical tendencies; the Doge was henceforth assisted, and his activities controlled, by a permanent organ, the *sapienti*, while the *dogato* ceased to be the hereditary appanage of a few families.

The expansion of Venice, extending from the Upper to the Lower Adriatic, naturally led to encounters with the Saracens and the Byzantines. Venice was allied with the Byzantines against the Saracens. When Southern Italy was free of the Saracens the Normans entered upon the scene; and owing to a community of interests Venice was leagued against them with the Byzantine Empire.

The rise of Venice presented close analogies with that of the maritime cities of Campania: Naples, Gaeta and Amalfi. These cities also developed their autonomy, their commercial prosperity and their naval power in the shadow of the nominal suzerainty of Byzantium. In their government, moreover, we see the clash of the monarchical and aristocratic elements, while they remained outside the feudal system. But they differed from Venice and the communes of the Italic kingdom in this, that their autonomous existence was checked by the Norman kingdom, which subjected them while leaving them in possession of certain local franchises.

In the inland cities of Southern Italy, especially in those of Apulia,

there was a middle class enriched by commerce, while their organization was almost communal. But here, earlier than in the maritime cities, the Norman conquest called a halt to such development.

§ 38. THE NEW CULTURE.—The expansion of communal life in Italy was accompanied by a recovery which was not only economic but also cultural and artistic. One of the most characteristic manifestations of the young communes was the development of the civic magistracy and the renaissance of the arts—in the first place of architecture—which accompanied it. The first centre of the new communal life was the cathedral, a building which was not purely ecclesiastical, but the possession of the whole body of citizens, who assembled in front of it and within it in order to discuss their most important affairs, and to celebrate the more solemn ceremonies of civic life, such as the swearing in of the consuls, or the blessing of the *carroccio* and the standards.

The new art whose appearance corresponded with the formation, now completed, of the new Western peoples, has been described as Romanic art, either to indicate its parallelism with the formation of the Romance or Neo-Latin tongues, or to signalize its reversion to certain Roman traditions and its departure from Byzantine conventions. Yet it must not be regarded as in any sense an imitation of ancient forms, but rather as a vital and original creation. Emerging towards the close of the 10th century, Romanic art attained its maximum splendour in the 12th century.

The Romanic church is akin to the Roman basilica, but it has a structure of its own. The horizontal roof, often of timber, is replaced by stone vaulting, first semi-cylindrical or barrel-shaped, then cruciform (that is, with intersecting arches). The principal nave forms a Latin cross, being intersected by a transverse nave or transept. The naves are always divided by round arches, supported, as a rule, by pilasters rather than by columns, and the pilasters are often fasciated, continuing the nervatures of the vault when this is cruciform. Further, the architraves over the doors and windows are replaced by round arches, often multiple in the case of the doorways, and supported upon piers furnished with small columns. Outside the church the

portico disappears; but as though to make up for this the façade has developed a complicated structure, based upon a number of doorways, or consisting of a series of superimposed arches and columns, grouped together in several tiers, and extending also to the lateral walls and the apse. And the apse itself, which is sometimes multiple, has undergone remarkable developments. The doors and external arcades and the capitals of the columns are richly decorated, generally with animal forms, or fantastic and monstrous creatures; so that the development of ecclesiastical architecture was accompanied by that of sculpture, though the greatest achievements of sculpture were the fruits of a later period.

In Italy the Romanic style was tempered by the persistent influence of antiquity, and hence of the basilical type of architecture, so that there were still churches without vaulted roof or columns, and even churches with a circular ground-plan, especially if they were designed as baptisteries. In Upper Italy there were Romanic cathedrals as early as the 11th century: Sant'Ambrogio in Milan, the anterior portion of which was reconstructed in the second half of the 11th century; San Michele in Pavia, rebuilt on the site of the very ancient basilica between 1004 and 1135, and followed by the more progressive San Pietro in Ciel d'Oro and San Teodoro; and Sant'Abbondio in Como, consecrated in 1095. The masterpiece of Romanic architecture in Upper Italy is the cathedral of Modena, begun by the architect Lanfranc in 1099. San Zeno in Verona was modelled upon this cathedral as regards the general plan, though it has an architectural spirit of its own.—San Zeno was rebuilt after the earthquake of 1117, which also necessitated the reconstruction of the cathedral of Parma.

In Tuscany the persistent influence of the basilica made itself much more strongly felt. We see this in Florence, in the basilical ground-plan of San Miniato, begun in 1018, where the joyous lightness of the structure and the decorative splendour of the façade are authentic manifestations of youthful fervour and *joie de vivre*. In Florence, again, we have the octagonal baptistery with its dome, which probably rose from the site of a much older building, and which was consecrated by Nicholas II in 1059. A wonderful creation is the cathedral of Pisa, begun in 1063 (by the architect Buschetto, and then by Rainaldo),

in which paleo-Christian heredity, Oriental influences, and new Romanic motives are fused in a fabric with a basilical ground-plan, with transept and cupola, and a magnificent façade with superimposed arcades. The decorative splendour and pictorial effect almost rival those of San Marco in Venice.

In Rome there was not as yet any notable architectural development save in the building of slender rectangular campanili, enlivened by fenestrations with round arches and incrustated with multicoloured marbles. The Roman tradition of painting was continued, in which, side by side with Byzantine mannerisms, a less rigid indigenous tendency was asserting itself, above all in the more recent paintings (11th century) in the subterranean church of San Clemente. In Apulia an original local school of architecture—modified, however, by Lombard influences—built San Nicola di Vari in 1087. In Sicily the development of art coincided with the definitive establishment of the Norman kingdom, of which we shall speak later.

Venice, with San Marco, here calls for special mention. The reconstruction of the basilica after 1043, on the site of the earlier church, which was built immediately after the translation of the body of St. Mark, is attributed to artists coming from the East during the *dogato* of Domenico Contarini. Contarini's basilica, built in accordance with the ground plan of the church of the Santi Apostoli in Constantinople (dating from the age of Justinian), assumed the form of a Greek cross, each arm of which supported a cupola, while another cupola rose above the intersection of the two limbs of the cross. Between the cupolas the great vaults of the roof, supported on pilasters connected by round arches, formed the static elements of the fabric; and the conjunction of these various architectural members gave rise to a stupendous variety of prospects, while on every hand the mosaics spread their coloured tapestries. The façade and the external decoration were Romanic in type.

The new communal life was reflected with less splendour than in the arts, but with more direct reference to events, in the literature of the time. In the Italy of the 11th century, and even in that of the 12th (otherwise than in France), the literature was still entirely Latin; for so far the Romanic language had hardly made itself felt as a literary

language. But this literature no longer confined itself to hagiographic records and theological disputes; it recorded the events of the day, and among them the first achievements of the newborn communes. The monk Donizone wrote the life of the Countess Matilda in hexameters; authors whose identity is doubtful or unknown celebrated in their poems the victorious expedition of the Pisans to Africa in 1088, and the conquest of the Balearics by Pisa in 1113. The wars between Milan and Como at the beginning of the 12th century (§ 41) were sung by an unknown Comasco poet.

We have already spoken of the development of canon law, which testified to the power of the Church, and above all of the Papacy. But there was at the same time a resurrection of Roman law, which to a certain extent competed with it, representing one of the most important manifestations of the reviving secular spirit. Its origins, in fact, were wholly independent of theology, canon law, and ecclesiastical tradition, and it tended, by its very nature, to affirm the authority of the unitary State as against that of the Church and the feudal autonomies. Roman law had never been completely submerged by Germanic law; in the system of personal rights admitted as juridically co-existing by the Carolingian regime, and those which followed it, there had always been those who had elected to live in accordance with Roman rather than Lombard, Frankish or other law. This was especially the case in Central Italy and in Rome, but not there alone. At the close of the 11th century the study of Roman law revived for reasons which have as yet received little attention. It was favoured by the princes and the communes, and the revival of economic life, in all its multiple forms, made it natural to look for rules and institutions in the juridical science of antiquity. A centre of this reviving study of Roman law was Bologna, which became famous for its school of law, and a focal point of the new culture. Here Irnerius taught (*d.* 1125), the first great mediaeval glossator (commentator) of the Roman laws; but he had many successors. To him Henry V resorted for juridical decisions in his conflict with the Roman Church.

The scientific traditions of antiquity, perfected under the influence of Arabic science, held their own in Italy in the medical school of Salerno. This too enjoyed European fame.

Further, the so-called scholastic philosophy and theology had their beginnings at the close of the 11th and the first half of the 12th century: Italy added her contribution in the work of Anselm of Aosta (1033–1109), who taught, however, in France and England, and of Peter the Lombard (§ 37).

§ 39. THE KINGDOM OF SICILY.—The development of communal autonomy in Upper Italy and the definitive constitution of the Norman state in the South were favoured by the crisis in the Empire which occurred on the death of Henry V. Henry left no sons to follow him: the faction which strove to continue the imperial policy of the Salic house was led by Frederick of Hohenstaufen, Duke of Swabia, son of a sister of Henry V, and by his brother Conrad, Duke of Franconia. But the opposing faction triumphed with the election of Lothar, Duke of Saxony (Lothar II, 1125–1138). Lothar's election was countered by the election of Conrad, and the two factions were henceforth known as Guelfs (from the Guelf House of Bavaria, which supported Lothar) and Ghibellines (from the fortress of Weibling, which belonged to the House of Swabia); names which were subsequently applied to the supporters of the Church and the Empire respectively.

Pope Honorius II pronounced in favour of Lothar. In Upper Italy Conrad obtained the royal crown at Monza from the Archbishop of Milan, who was once more in conflict with the pontiff (1128). On the other hand, the majority of the Lombard cities were opposed to Conrad, who was compelled to return to Germany. Lothar, having gained the upper hand in Germany, entered Italy in his turn, in order to regularize the state of affairs in Rome and the South.

In Rome, on the death of Honorius II, a schism had been caused by the conflict between the faction of the Frangipane, of the old nobility, and the faction of the Pierleoni, a family of converted Jews, recently enriched, who were supported by the lesser nobility and the middle class. One party of the cardinals elected Anacletus II, a member of the Pierleoni family, and another Innocent II. Anacletus II was triumphant in Rome, and Innocent took refuge in France, where, chiefly owing to the efforts of St. Bernard (§ 34), he was acknowledged



by the greater part of Christendom. The new ruler of the South, Roger II, declared in favour of Anacletus.

Roger II was the son of Roger I, the conqueror of Sicily; he had inherited the crown of Sicily on the death of his father in 1101. To the island he added the Norman dominions on the mainland, the line descended from the eldest son of Robert Guiscard being extinct. (As we have seen, the second son, Bohemond, had established himself in Syria.) This unification, which was effected in 1127, was opposed by Honorius II, who, pursuing a Papal policy which dated back to the days of Charlemagne, was endeavouring to assert the supremacy and even the direct rule of the Roman Curia in the South. He adopted, in his opposition to Roger, the political weapon of local autonomies as well as the spiritual weapon of excommunication; but he was unsuccessful, and had to reconcile himself to investing Roger with the government of Calabria and Apulia; which, however, meant a re-affirmation of the old Papal sovereignty in the South. When Honorius was dead and the schism was a thing of the past Roger declared for Anacletus II and was invested by him with the kingdom of Sicily (September 1130). The constitution of this kingdom was in contradiction to the boasted rights of the Empire over Southern Italy, and also to the policy of the Roman Curia; so that Lothar II was induced to make war upon Roger both in the interests of the Papacy and in defence of the traditions of the Empire.

A first descent into Italy (1132) with inadequate forces yielded but little result, and in Rome Lothar was unable to capture the Leonine City and the Castel Sant'Angelo from the Pierleoni. However, Innocent II was restored to the Lateran, and there—since St. Peter's was not available—he crowned Lothar Emperor (June 1133). He also conceded to him as a fief a portion of the allodial domains of the Countess Matilda (it having been admitted, without dispute, that the feudal possessions had lapsed to the Empire); and in consequence of this investiture the Papal Curia boasted that the Emperor had become a vassal of the Pope. After this Lothar returned to Germany without attacking Roger II, who defeated the *signori* and the rebellious cities of Southern Italy, completing the work of unification by compelling Capua and Naples to acknowledge his suzerainty. Even Rome

was obliged once more to abandon Pope Innocent, who withdrew to Pisa, a city which favoured his cause, as did Genoa, owing to their rivalry with Amalfi, which was subject to Roger II.

In 1131 Lothar II entered Italy for the second time, with a much larger army. After overcoming a certain amount of resistance in Lombardy he invaded the South, where the *signori* were once more in rebellion against Roger. At the same time the Pisans attacked Amalfi from the sea, sacking the city and working such destruction that it never recovered (1137). However, the Emperor's advance into Apulia produced no lasting effects; the German troops, who were sorely tried by the Southern climate, and weary of a war that seemed to profit no one but the Pope, were unwilling to continue the campaign; moreover, political differences arose between Lothar and the pontiff. Lothar turned back and recrossed the Alps, dying almost immediately afterwards (December 1137).

He had appointed as his successor the Duke of Bavaria, Henry the Proud, the head of the House of Guelf, to whom he had already given Saxony, Tuscany, Spoleto and some of the Countess Matilda's domains. But Conrad of Swabia was elected (Conrad III, 1138-1152), and the war between the Guelfs and Ghibellines broke out once more. Conrad III, who was engaged first in the civil war, and then in the Second Crusade, did not enter Italy, where the communes of the North were free to develop their autonomy, while in the South the kingdom of Sicily was finally constituted.

Innocent II, who had hitherto been victorious in the contest for the Papal throne, was defeated in battle by Roger II, who actually took him prisoner. By the Treaty of Mignano (1139) the pontiff invested Roger II with the kingdom of Sicily as vassal of the Holy See. Benevento was left in the possession of the Pope. The kingdom of Southern Italy having been thus definitively constituted, there followed a rapid process of fusion of the different ethnic elements of the population (Roman, Greek, Lombard, Saracen, Norman). Roger II did not abolish the national and local customs, but he saw to it that the royal authority was supreme over all, instituting a body of public functionaries who were subject to the king as his employees and not as his vassals. In this formation of a State bureaucracy the

kingdom of Sicily was in advance of all the other Western states. The Musulmans, who were not in any way persecuted by the Norman kings, played a considerable part in the formation and the activities of this royal bureaucracy.

Under Musulman rule Sicily had already enjoyed remarkable prosperity: agriculture, industry and commerce had made great progress, and the population had considerably increased. This development continued under the Norman kings; the court of Roger II was famed for its magnificence, and the king took pains to encourage the arts, in which Arabic and Byzantine elements were combined with a certain degree of Romanic influence, with notable results. Palermo was embellished with such splendid monuments as the Palatine Chapel and the cathedral of Monreale.

The constitution of a powerful kingdom in the South was naturally followed by its expansion in the Balkan Peninsula and Africa. In the Balkans the Sicilian kingdom collided with the Byzantine Empire. Already Robert Guiscard had fixed his gaze upon Epirus and Albania, laying siege to Durazzo (1081), the key to the Balkan Peninsula on the Italian side. The Emperor Alexius Comnenus was supported by Venice, for the Venetians could not allow the two shores of the Strait of Otranto to fall into the hands of the same potentate. Guiscard was defeated by the Greco-Venetian fleet; but on land he was victorious over the Byzantine army at Pharsalia (1081), and so Durazzo fell into his hands (1082). But the campaign was interrupted, for Robert had to return to Italy, as Henry IV had entered the peninsula (§33). Roger II now resumed the policy of expansion, and his admiral Christodoulos ravaged the Grecian coast, took Corinth, and destroyed the silk factories of Thebes, removing many of the workers to Sicily, whither the silk industry was transplanted.

With more lasting success Roger II made war upon the Musulmans in Africa, occupying the island of Malta and various points on the coast of Tunis and Tripoli.

§ 40. THE COMMUNE OF ROME.—At this period the commune was establishing itself even in Rome. Already, during the War of Investitures, the Roman population, taking up an intermediate

position, had asserted its own power. The great nobles were no longer the only persons to be considered; beside them and against them the lesser nobility was asserting itself, together with the middle class, the majority consisting of artisans and the minority of merchants. As in the other communes these classes had begun to exercise the powers of the bishop, so in Rome they began to usurp the powers of the pontiff.

Towards the close of the pontificate of Innocent II the Romans rebelled because he wished to prevent them from destroying Tivoli. One of the earliest manifestations of the Roman commune, as of the communes of Northern Italy, was the tendency to subject the surrounding countryside, and the neighbouring centres of population. The rebellion led to the constitution, by a *parlamento* assembled on Campidoglio, of a popular government (1143), at the head of which was a council which adopted the name, half classical and half mediæval, of *Sacer Senatus*. An attempt on the part of Pope Lucius II to seize Campidoglio ended in his defeat, and he died of the wounds received in the battle (February 1145). His successor Eugenius III fled from Viterbo to France after a vain attempt at conciliation on the part of St. Bernard.

One particular difficulty experienced by the commune of Rome was the fact that it had to deal directly with the two heads of the political society of the age—the Emperor and the Pope, both of them sovereigns of Rome. And since the head of the universal Church was one and the same person as the Bishop of Rome, it will be understood that in Rome the communal movement was more conscious than elsewhere of the delicate problem of the relations between the spiritual and the temporal power. A tendency both religious and political began to manifest itself—the tendency to deprive the clergy of its national possessions and its temporal authority. The most notable advocate of this reform was an Augustinian monk, Arnold of Brescia. In France he had been the disciple of a daring thinker who fell under the condemnation of the Church: Peter Abelard. Arnold preached the return of the clergy to its primitive simplicity and poverty, and its abandonment of all earthly interests, in order that it might dedicate itself entirely to its spiritual mission. Exiled from his native

city, condemned by the Church, and attacked by St. Bernard, thanks to whom he was driven out of France, Arnold came to Rome, where we discover him, in 1147, as the moral head of the new popular government, in which the movement in favour of reviving the ancient Roman republic was gathering strength. Although he was excommunicated by Eugenius III (1198) he remained in Rome, his position being one of great influence.

§ 41. THE IMPERIAL REVOLUTION OF FREDERICK BARBAROSSA.—Since the Emperor Lothar II had been unable effectively to assert his authority in Italy, while his successor Conrad III had not even entered the country, the autonomous evolution of the peninsula had been able to continue and to consolidate itself, following two different lines of development—that of the communes in Upper Italy, and that of the unitary kingdom in the South. Among the communes a certain differentiation was already manifesting itself, inasmuch as some of the more powerful cities had extended their dominion not only over the surrounding countryside, but also over lesser cities: actuated by motives of security, or the need of territory, or the desire to control the great trade routes. Thus, Milan had subjected Lodi and Como—one important as giving access to the Po, the other as lying on the line of communications with the transalpine world—while it had concluded alliances with Crema and Tortona, which were enemies respectively of Cremona and Pavia. This latter city, being finally deprived of its rank of capital, was particularly inimical to Milan. Thus hostile groups of communes were beginning to form themselves; and in general it may be said that every city was tending to become the enemy of its neighbours and the ally of its neighbours' neighbours.

While in Lombardy properly so called the feudal system had been enormously reduced in importance, since the feudatories had been compelled to submit themselves to the greater communes, this was not the case in Piedmont and the Veneto. In Piedmont there was no lack of communes, even of fairly flourishing communes, such as that of Asti, but the great feudal lords still retained their power: for example, the Marquis of Monferrato, and after him the Counts of

Savoy, the Marquises of Saluzzo, etc. In the Veneto, beside communes which had already become important, such as those of Verona and Padua, there was the great feudal *signoria* of the Patriarch of Aquileia, who resided at Cividale. The patriarch was usually a German, a solid prop of the Empire on the eastern frontier of Italy, which he kept open for the imperial troops. Venice, as a general thing, did not as yet interfere in the affairs of the mainland, except to safeguard her commercial privileges. Even in Tuscany and the Duchy of Spoleto feudalism and the imperial jurisdiction were still powerful, having in these regions a special fulcrum in the domains of the late Countess Matilda. Hence an emperor who wished to revive the Ottonian and Salian traditions of dominion over Italy would find no lack of auxiliary forces and points of support. Such an emperor was Frederick of Swabia or Hohenstaufen (1152-1190), known as Barbarossa. The nephew of Conrad III, who had nominated him as his successor, he was also the son of a sister of Henry the Proud, and these relationships helped him to make peace between the two rival dynasties. Henry the Lion, son of Henry the Proud, was reconciled with the Empire, and acquired a position of very great importance, especially in Northern Germany. An uncle of his, Guelf VI, was invested with the government of Tuscany, Spoleto, and the domains of the Countess Matilda. Frederick Barbarossa, while conceding a generous share to the rival house, consolidated the territories under his own immediate rule in Swabia and Franconia, and further strengthened his position by his marriage with Beatrice, Countess of Upper Burgundy, thus creating in Southern Germany a fairly compact zone on which he could place reliance, thanks in some degree to the activities of the royal functionaries (*ministeriali*). He contrived to assert the rights of royalty over the greater and lesser feudality, both lay and ecclesiastical; and taking full advantage of the faculties conceded to him in Germany by the Concordat of Worms, he intervened actively in the nomination of bishops; so that under him Germany had a church of a definitely national character, readier to listen to its king than to the Roman pontiff.

Having thus reinforced the royal power in Germany, he employed it in the service of his imperialistic ideal, which was partly inherited

from the traditions of earlier Emperors, beginning with Charlemagne (whom he got the Antipope Pascal III to canonize), and partly inspired by the resuscitated Roman law (§ 38) according to which the Emperor was the universal and absolute sovereign, thanks to the alleged delegation which the Roman people had made to him, once and for all time, of its own powers. Barbarossa therefore regarded himself as the ruler of the world, from whom the princes of the various European countries received the legitimation of their power. He did effectively assert his suzerainty over Hungary, Bohemia, Poland and Denmark, and he even attempted to assert it in the case of France and England, whose sovereigns he described as *reges provinciarum*.

An imperialistic programme of this nature had to be applied first of all in Italy, in three separate fields. The communes of Upper Italy which had become accustomed to the independent exercise of sovereign or "regalian" rights (election of magistrates, institution of monopolies and other imposts, the right to make peace or war, etc.) had to be reduced to obedience. It was necessary to make an end of the usurpation perpetrated by the Normans in the south by the constitution of a kingdom independent of the Empire. Lastly, the rights of the Empire must be asserted against the Papacy, both in the administration of the Church, and in the territories of Central Italy which were dependent upon the Papacy: and above all in Rome, the seat of Empire.

To begin with, however, Barbarossa entered into alliance with the pontificate, concluding an agreement by which he was assured of the imperial crown, and the use of the weapon of excommunication against his opponents, while he pledged himself to support the Pope against the Roman commune and its inspirer, Arnold of Brescia, and against the kingdom of Sicily. In respect of the latter there was only a negative coincidence of interests between emperor and pontiff, since the Pope could hardly congratulate himself on the intervention in Roman affairs of a sovereign who had frustrated his own territorial ambitions in the south.

Frederick I first entered Italy in October 1154, with only a small army, and was crowned king in Pavia. He convoked a Diet in the fields of Roncaglia, near Piacenza, and feudal *signori* appeared before

his imperial tribunal to appeal for justice against the communes, while small communes appealed for justice against the large ones, and especially against Milan. The Emperor declared null and void all transferences of fiefs effected without permission of the feudal overlord, and revoked all usurpations of feudal privileges from the reigns of Henry IV and Henry V onwards. Both decisions struck a heavy blow at the Lombard communes. However, for the time being these affirmations of the imperial power were largely theoretical. Frederick confined himself to ravaging the country about Milan, taking Asti and Chieri, which he gave to the marquis of Monferrato, and destroying Tortona. He then proceeded to Rome in order to obtain the imperial crown. At Viterbo he met Pope Hadrian IV (1154-1159)—an Englishman, and the only one of his nation to rise to the pontificate—definitely allying himself with the pontiff against Arnold and the Roman commune. Arnold, taken prisoner in the neighbourhood of Rome, was put to death; as for the commune, Frederick refused its offer of the imperial crown, abruptly refuting its claim to speak in the name of ancient Rome. He was crowned in St. Peter's by the Pope (June 1155); but he occupied only the Leonine City, and very soon left Rome, together with the Pope. He wished to march southwards, but the German feudatories, always loth to engage in these distant expeditions, in which they took no interest, refused to follow him, and he had to abandon the project. Turning back, he attacked Spoleto, which had refused to revictual his forces or pay tribute, sacked the city, and gave it to the flames. Arriving in Upper Italy, he pronounced sentence upon Milan, decreeing that it should be deprived of all regalian rights (the right of minting money was transferred to Cremona) and banned from the Empire. To place this ban upon it meant, in theory, to deprive the city of any juridical status, to forbid all other cities to have any dealings with it, and to place it at their mercy. But since Milan was a powerful city, the ban was worth no more than the parchment on which it was written. In September 1155 Frederick returned to Germany.

In the year of Frederick's Italian expedition Roger II of Sicily was succeeded by his son William I (1154-1166), known as William the Bad. The king owed this defamatory epithet to the harshness with



which he—or rather his minister, the admiral Maione of Bari—suppressed the rebellion of the magnates, especially in Apulia. The revolt had broken out in Frederick's descent into Italy, and the rebels, among whom was Robert, Prince of Capua, were revolting not only against the German Emperor and the Pope, but also against the Byzantine Emperor, Manuel I Comnenus. The latter immediately conceived the plan of a Byzantine reconquest of Southern Italy. His troops landed in Apulia, fomented the rebellion, occupied Bari and Trani, and laid siege to Brindisi (1155). However, the forces of the two Empires did not meet, as Barbarossa had not marched southwards; nor did anything come of the negotiations with a Byzantine envoy for a marriage which Frederick had proposed before his return to Germany. The Greeks continued the invasion on their own account, gaining a foothold halfway up the Adriatic and occupying Ancona (1157). But William I, coming from Sicily with a great army, stifled the revolt in Apulia and raised the siege of Brindisi, while the Byzantines were defeated at sea by the Norman fleet. Comnenus was forced to conclude peace (1158). Before this the Pope had been reconciled with the King of Sicily, granting him the investiture of the whole kingdom, including Capua and Naples (1156). However, the African conquests of Roger II were lost to Sicily.

By concluding an agreement with the King of Sicily independently of the Emperor, Pope Hadrian IV had acted in disregard of his understanding with the latter. There were other causes of conflict between the two powers; foremost among them being Frederick's ecclesiastical policy in Germany.

In June 1158 Frederick entered Italy for the second time with a huge army, which was afterwards reinforced by the great Italian feudatories and those of the Lombard communes—Pavia, Como, Lodi, and Cremona—who by reason of their hostility to Milan or the allies of Milan had come over to the side of the Emperor. Frederick succeeded in subjecting Brescia, rebuilding Lodi, and exacting the submission of Milan (September), which was henceforth obliged to ask the Emperor's approval when appointing consuls, while it was compelled to renounce its supremacy over Lodi and Como.

Frederick now took steps towards a radical settlement as regarded the situation of the cities and the *signori* in relation to the Empire, convoking a second Diet in Roncaglia (November 1158). He applied to the masters of Roman law teaching in Bologna, the scholars and successors of Irnerius—Bulgarus, Martinus Gosia, Jacopo and Ugo—for an exact definition of the *regalie*, or rights appertaining to the king and emperor, in the administration of cities and territories: which was to be based on the fundamental principle (taken directly from the Roman law) that the rights of the Empire were imprescriptible. Therefore no city or person might exercise such rights, however long established, unless an authentic title to them existed in the form of imperial concessions. Thus the Empire claimed the right to appoint magistrates, to administer justice, to coin money, to collect tolls, and to dispose of duchies, marquisates and counties. A revision of all feudal privileges was decreed, in order to ascertain which were based on authentic titles. All private wars were prohibited, and also all leagues between cities and factions. In these decisions of the Diet Frederick was supported by the Archbishop of Milan.

These deliberations concluded, Frederick applied himself to putting them into practice, by despatching to the Lombard cities magistrates of his own (*missi, potestates*) to govern them. Milan, on the strength of the agreement previously concluded, asserted her right to appoint consuls, and expelled the imperial officials; other cities joined her in offering resistance. Frederick resorted to military measures, beginning with the siege of Crema (July 1159–January 1160), a loyal ally of Milan, which was compelled to surrender after an obstinate resistance and was razed to the ground, in accordance with the methods of repression beloved by Barbarossa.

§ 42. THE COALITION AGAINST THE EMPIRE. LEGNANO.—Just as the decisive conflict with the Lombard communes was beginning there was a rupture between the Empire and the Papacy. The very fact that Frederick was aiming at the consolidation of his power in Upper Italy must have given the pontiff food for thought; but now the Emperor was actually on ecclesiastical territory, enforcing

his *regalie* against the bishops, claiming the privileges of the Concordat of Worms even in the election of Italian bishops, and asserting his power over the pontifical domains and over Rome itself (in conformity with the Carolingian and Ottonian traditions). Hadrian IV protested against the imperial thesis, and sought a *rapprochement* with the King of Sicily and the Lombard cities. Hostilities were imminent when the Pope died (September 1159). There was now a double election: the majority of the cardinals elected Cardinal Rolando Bandinelli, the leader of the Curialist faction, who took the name of Alexander III (1159–1181); a minority elected Cardinal Octavian, a kinsman of the Hohenstaufen, who took the name of Victor IV. Frederick, still in the name of his imperial privileges, claimed the right to decide the question in a Council which he convoked in Pavia, but whose competence Alexander refused to acknowledge. The Council recognized Victor, whose cause was supported by Germany and part of Upper Italy; while the anti-imperial communes, the King of Sicily, France, and England acknowledged Alexander III. Alexander excommunicated Frederick, absolving his subjects (without effect) from their oath of fealty. The Emperor, sending his troops to occupy Papal territory, forced Alexander to take refuge first in Genoa and then in France (1162).

In the meanwhile the war had continued in Lombardy between the imperial troops (assisted by the forces of Novara, Como, Lodi, and Cremona) and the Milanese, who were supported by Brescia. In August 1160 a double encounter ended with the discomfiture of the imperial forces, and the Milanese began the rebuilding of Crema. In the following year Frederick, having raised an army from the cities and the Italian *signori*, received strong reinforcements from Germany, so that he was able to defeat the Milanese in the field and blockade the city. Milan, reduced to a state of famine and deprived of succour, surrendered at discretion on the 1 March 1162. Frederick decreed that the city should be destroyed, and this was done by the men of Como, Novara, Pavia and Cremona. The inhabitants were divided among four country towns. All resistance ceased in Lombardy, and the laws of Roncaglia were applied in full. The imperial *podestà* were appointed to govern the communes, except in a few

loyal cities, such as Cremona, to which the Emperor conceded the privilege of retaining its own consuls. The *podestà* distinguished themselves by their extortions, which were very soon felt to be intolerable.

It remained for the Emperor to conquer the Pope and the South. The first of these victories was particularly difficult, since Frederick could not hope, by force of arms, to compel the whole Catholic world to acknowledge the Antipope Victor IV, and his successors Pascal III (1164) and Calixtus III (1168). In Germany there was already a movement in favour of Alexander, who in November 1165, concluding peace with the Roman commune, was able to re-enter upon his see.

As regards the kingdom of Sicily, Frederick I entered Italy for the third time in October 1163, having planned a descent upon Southern Italy, in which Genoa and Pisa were to have assisted him. However, the two cities were then at war, mainly on account of Sardinia, and the Emperor was embarrassed rather than advantaged by their conflict, which spread to Tuscany, where Lucca was allied with Genoa against Pisa, while Pisa was supported by Florence. Since the Emperor fell ill, and since his forces were rather inadequate, the idea of the expedition to Southern Italy had to be postponed. And so the kingdom of Sicily was once more saved from a perilous situation. William I's minister Maione had been killed by a nobleman, to the general jubilation (1160). In Palermo his slayer, Bonello, hatched a conspiracy which succeeded in seizing the king's person and proclaiming his son Roger, a minor, in his place. But the people did not support the conspirators; the clergy took the part of the king; the king's party prevailed and liberated him, and in the accompanying disorder Roger was killed (1161). William having suppressed the revolt in Sicily and on the mainland, the defeated barons went over to Frederick. A few years later William was succeeded by his second son, William II (The Good, 1166-1189), reigning at first under the tutelage of his mother. After some little time the general disorder abated and peace was restored in the kingdom.

Even in Upper Italy the Emperor's rule was not secure. In the winter of 1163-1164 the cities of the Veronese March (later known

as the Trevisan March)—Verona, Vicenza, Padua and Treviso—formed a league (*lega Veronese*) and obtained the support of Venice, then in conflict with her imperial and feudal overlord, the Patriarch of Aquileia. Further to the south the Emperor Manuel Comnenus was in occupation of Ancona.

At the end of 1166 Frederick entered Italy for the fourth time. He held a Diet in Lodi, in which the Lombard cities presented claims which had not yet received a hearing; he then moved into Emilia, with the object of consolidating his government, and laid siege to Ancona. Behind him the revolt of the Lombard cities broke out, a revolt promoted by the imperialist city of Cremona, which formed a league with Mantua, Bergamo, Brescia and the Milanese. This agreement, which was the original nucleus of the Lombard League, was concluded in the monastery of Pontida, between Bergamo and Lecco (April 1167). Frederick, having obtained the submission of Ancona, felt that it was of more urgent importance to intervene in Rome and Southern Italy. He took possession of the Leonine City, where he was crowned a second time in St. Peter's by Pascal III, and entered into an agreement with the Roman commune, by which he obtained the right to install the senate and to appoint the prefect of the city, who would exercise his administrative powers in the name of the Emperor. Alexander III withdrew to Benevento. Once more, however, the expedition to the South had to be abandoned, as a terrible epidemic decimated the imperial army. At the same time the Emperor was abandoned by almost all his supporters in Lombardy, where the League of Pontida had amalgamated with the Veronese League, finally constituting the Lombard League (1 December 1167). Only Como and Pavia remained faithful to the Emperor. Frederick reached Susa by way of Monferrato and the territory of the Count of Savoy, but at the beginning of 1168 a revolt on the part of the city forced him to flee in disguise across the pass of Mont Cenis. He had to remain for more than six years in Germany, in order to guard his own interest in that country. In the meantime the forces of the Lombard League were continually increasing, being supported by alliances with the Pope, the King of Sicily, and the Byzantine Emperor. Even imperial cities like Novara and Como joined the League, by inclination

or perforce, and so did certain feudatories, among them the Count of Biandrate in Lombardy and Marquis Malaspina in Lunigiana. Milan had risen from its ruins, and on rebuilding the walls had increased their circuit, since the population had increased. The Marquis of Monferrato and the city of Pavia were still opposed to the League; and the better to oppose them the allies founded, in 1168, a new town at the confluence of the Tanaro and the Bormida, naming it Alessandria after the Pope, though the people of Pavia scornfully called it a city of straw, for owing to the haste of its construction most of the roofs were thatched with straw. The only thing that happened to weaken the League was that Venice withdrew from it, being hostile to an ally of the League, the Byzantine Emperor Manuel, and filled with uneasiness at seeing Ancona in his hands. Consequently, when Barbarossa sent his chancellor Christian, Archbishop of Mainz, to lay siege to Ancona (1174), the Venetian fleet took part in the siege. Ancona put up a gallant defence, and the blockade was raised, thanks to help from Romagna. Now the King of Sicily joined twice in making war upon the Emperor Manuel, who decided to make peace.

Frederick descended into Italy for the fifth time in the autumn of 1174, passing through the territory of his ally the Count of Savoy. Pavia and Monferrato were still on his side, while Central Italy was occupied by the army of Christian, and the old Duke Guelph VI (§ 41) had surrendered his fiefs to the Emperor. Rome, too, was still hostile to the Pope, who was unable to enter the city. Frederick burned Susa, subjected Asti, and laid siege to Alessandria. The latter held out until Easter 1175, when a victorious sortie of the besieged forces, and the arrival of the League army at Tortone, compelled Frederick to raise the siege. The heads of the League, however, instead of risking a decisive battle, concluded the armistice of Montebello with the Emperor (April 1175), entrusting the settlement of the controversy to a commission of arbitrators, while both sides dismissed their troops.

The negotiations, in which the Pope also took part, were unavailing. The Lombard cities were able quickly to reassemble their troops, while Frederick had to wait for the greater part of his forces to arrive from Germany, and Henry the Lion, who could easily have come to

his assistance, being in Bavaria, refused to move. Other German magnates arrived, however; and Frederick, then near the Lake of Como, having received these reinforcements, and with them the troops of Como, which had come over to the side of the Empire, marched southwards to meet the forces of Pavia and Monferrato. This time the Milanese, with other troops of the League, held the pass between Ticino and Olona, and the battle of Legnano followed (29 May 1176). The charge of the Germany chivalry drove the Leaguers back until they had almost reach the *carroccio*; but the picked body of men who guarded the standard, known as the "Company of Death," rushed forward to the rescue. Other League troops having joined them, the imperial army, which was probably somewhat inferior in numbers, was completely routed.

§ 43. THE DISBANDING OF THE COALITION. THE SWABIANS IN SICILY.—The Leaguers did not make the most of their victory, whether because they doubted their own strength, or were not in complete agreement, or—as is more likely—because their mentality, as had been evident in the preceding year, was essentially defensive. They did not deny the authority of the Empire, but wished for reconciliation and the imperial sanction. Frederick was therefore able to remain in Italy, and in order to break the coalition he entered into negotiations with the Pope. In the preliminary conversation at Anagni (November 1176) he acknowledged Alexander III, granted to the Roman Church the *regalie* (that is, the territories and privileges) which it had enjoyed in the time of Innocent II, and therefore the estates of the Countess Matilda as they had then existed, and renounced the right to appoint an imperial prefect in Rome; which amounts to saying that he surrendered the effective government of the city.

The agreement of Anagni meant the beginning of the end for the League: Cremona and Tortona made separate peace with the Emperor. The League and the King of Sicily, together with the pontiff, entered into negotiations for peace in Venice (July–August 1177); but the League and Sicily concluded a truce only, while the Pope, deserting his allies, entered into a definitive agreement with the Emperor, to whom he granted absolution in the portico of St. Mark's, while

he surrendered Matilda's estates for a term of fifteen years. Returning to Rome, Alexander III came to terms also with the Roman commune, recognizing the senate provided that it did homage to him, and restored St. Peter's to him, with the other pontifical rights. Subsequently, in a Lateran Council (11th Oecumenical Council, March 1179), the conditions of the Papal elections were definitely established. According to these the candidate who received two-thirds of the votes of the Sacred College was elected Pope (as is the case to this day), and the Emperor's right of confirming the Papal nomination was finally abolished.

The peace negotiations with the League were not so quickly concluded: in the meantime Frederick had reinforced his position in Germany, defeating Henry the Lion and putting him to the ban. The Lombard League, now isolated, was losing its coherence; Alessandria, its own creation, made unconditional submission to the Emperor, and on receiving his pardon changed its name to Caesarea, as though it had been founded by imperial concession.

Peace was concluded between the Emperor and the Lombard cities at Constance (25 June 1183). The Emperor accorded a favourable reception to the confederates, recognized the League, granted the cities which composed it regalian rights within their walls, and in some cases over the surrounding district, and the privilege of electing their own magistrates. These, however, were to receive their investiture from him. The Emperor retained the right of jurisdiction in the second instance, to be exercised by his representatives in Italy, and when he entered Italy the cities must provide him with the *fodro* (travelling expenses) and victuals. Every ten years the cities were to renew their oath of fealty. This was a compromise between Frederick's plans of a centralized government and complete civic autonomy; the near future was to show the decisive preponderance of the sacred element; although the communes never declared (and did not even think of declaring) their complete independence of the Empire.

Barbarossa's position in Italy after the peace of Constance was still remarkably strong. In Lombardy he respected the urban autonomy which he had recognized, but he contrived to intervene in their disputes, which were not long delayed, so that his personal



friendship was valued and his imperial authority respected. His relations with Milan were particularly friendly, and on his sixth and last descent into Italy (1184) he concluded a treaty of alliance with the Milanese. Taking sides with Milan against Cremona, he fostered the rebuilding of Crema, to the detriment of the former, while granting to the Cremonese the possession of certain fortresses. In Piedmont, Tuscany and Romagna Barbarossa appointed vicars and other functionaries, endeavouring to assert his sovereignty through a sort of imperial bureaucracy.

But Frederick's great achievement in this last period was his agreement with the King of Sicily, which gave his family the inheritance of the kingdom. This agreement was probably facilitated by the renewed outbreak of hostilities between William II and the Eastern Empire. In 1182 the populace of Constantinople had perpetrated a terrible massacre of the Latins established in the city. Three years later the armies of William II occupied Thessalonica, where they perpetrated, in reprisal, another terrible massacre. Venice was inclined to rally to Constantinople, in order to balance the maritime power of the kingdom of Sicily. The Norman kingdom therefore came to an understanding with the German Empire: William II betrothed the only legitimate scion of the dynasty, Constance, the daughter of Roger II (already somewhat advanced in years), to Henry, the eldest son of the Emperor (1184).

By this the House of Swabia had more than made up for its losses in Upper Italy; and the acquisition was personal to the dynasty. The Lombard communes ought to have given some thought to the new and important base which the Emperor had obtained in Italy; but they did not trouble themselves about it. The Pope, on the other hand, who was in danger of finding himself between two fires, realized the peril immediately. Lucius III, adopting a hostile attitude, refused to crown Henry Emperor during the lifetime of his father; and under Urban III (1185-1187) the reaction was still more acute. Frederick's response was the celebration in Milan of the marriage of Henry and Constance; and in Milan Henry was crowned King of Italy, assuming the title of Caesar (Kaiser), so that he was henceforth an associate in Empire. The representatives of all the Italian cities attended the

celebration, excepting Cremona (which was subjected to the ban of the Empire, deprived by the Emperor of some of its territory, and compelled to submit itself). There was now a fresh rupture between Emperor and Pope, and Henry invaded the Papal State, allying himself with the Roman commune, which had for some time been at odds with the pontiffs, who no longer resided in Rome. In the meantime, Jerusalem having fallen into the hands of the Seldjukid Turks (1187), Pope Clement III concluded peace with the Emperor on the condition that Frederick should leave for the East. This he did, in the so-called Third Crusade, and was drowned in Cilicia (June 1190). Clement III made his peace also with the Roman commune (1188), the relations between the commune and the pontiff being analogous to those between the Lombard communes and the Emperor.

William II died in November 1189, and a strong local party opposed Henry's succession to the throne of Sicily, their own candidate being Tancred, Count of Lecce, an illegitimate scion of the Norman dynasty, who was acknowledged King of Sicily by Clement III. Henry VI (1190-1197) entered Italy at the end of 1190, when he procured the alliance of a number of the communes and the great signori of Northern Italy, and above all of Genoa and Pisa, whose fleets were of the greatest value in his expedition against the South. The Romans, to whom he conceded the right to destroy Tusculum, compelled Pope Celestine III to crown Henry Emperor (1191). He then advanced further into Italy, laying siege to Naples, but a terrible epidemic compelled him to abandon the siege, while in Germany the Guelf faction, supported for reasons of dynastic relationship by England, took up arms again and appeared to be getting the upper hand. But having fallen into the Emperor's hands, the King of England, Richard Cœur de Lion, who was returning from the Holy Land, was compelled to make peace, the conditions being dictated by Henry; after which the Guelf faction had to give in. Henry then returned to Italy. Tancred had died in February 1194, leaving a son (William III) who was still a minor. This time the kingdom was conquered and held in an iron grip; William was imprisoned and sent to Germany. At the end of 1194 Henry assumed the imperial crown in Palermo.

Thus almost at once stroke the Swabian house, which already held the Empire, and the imperial strongholds in Northern and Central Italy, had now become the immediate ruler of the South, thereby acquiring in Italy military and above all financial power of the first order. Now the domination of all Italy appeared a natural and by no means remote goal. But with this end in view it became more than ever essential to gain a strong position in Central Italy, which divided the Kingdom of Sicily from Northern Italy and Germany. And indeed, Henry VI proceeded to consolidate and develop the organization of imperial functionaries already installed by his father. These functionaries were subordinate to certain supreme representatives of the Empire in the several regions, all of whom were Germans: Marcovald, Duke of Romagna and Marquis of Ancona; Phillip of Swabia, Henry's brother, Marquis of Tuscany; Conrad, Marquis of Spoleto. The better to consolidate the power of his family, Henry wished to have the crown of Germany declared hereditary in the House of Swabia; but then, in order to avoid the open rebellion of the magnates, he contented himself with procuring the election of his infant son Roger. His imperialistic policy looked eastward also, and in 1196 he once more entered Italy, to prepare, under cover of the Crusade, a great expedition against the Greek Empire, when he died suddenly in Messina, at the age of 32, in September 1197.

## CHAPTER VIII

### *GUELF AND GHIBELLINES, NOBLES AND PEOPLE*

§ 44. INNOCENT III.—The premature death of Henry VI put a stop to the process of imperialistic unification from the Baltic to Sicily, and deprived it of its bases. In Germany the Swabian party, disregarding the previous election of the little Frederick, elected Philip of Swabia, who had hurried up from Central Italy. The Guelf faction supported the claim of Otto of Brunswick, son of Henry the Lion. The contest assumed an international character, Richard I of England supporting Otto, who was his nephew, while Philip Augustus of France, Richard's enemy, took the part of Philip of Swabia.

In Italy, according to a contemporary chronicle poem, "*Omnia cum papa gaudent de morte tyranni*"—"all rejoiced with the Pope at the tyrant's death." Philip, not without difficulty, succeeded in escaping from Tuscany, where on the death of Henry VI a great league of Tuscan cities had been formed, with Florence at its head (though Pisa still remained an imperial city), whose programme was to obey neither emperor, king, duke nor marquis without a common agreement. Even in the Duchy of Spoleto, the March of Ancona, and Romagna, the German functionaries appointed by Henry VI were expelled, and the cities recovered their autonomy. Profiting by this movement, the new Pope, Innocent III (Lotario dei Conti de Segri (1198-1216), who became Pope when only 38 years of age, was wholly inspired by the principles of canon law and the theories of theocracy in their most accentuated form. During the whole of his pontificate he did everything possible to assert the pontifical power over the bishops and the local institutions of the Church, regarding the temporal sovereigns as the vassals of the pontiff, since the Lord had bidden Peter to govern not only the whole Church, but the whole world. He was perfectly well aware of the necessity of a secure local base if he was to exert his universal

authority; for which reason he sought to constitute an efficient and extensive pontifical government in Central Italy, and above all in Rome. Here he exacted an oath of fealty either from the prefect of the city (previously the representative of the Emperor) or from the senate of the commune, and he also succeeded in appointing the only senator, a magistrate who sometimes took the place of the collegiate senate. Outside Latium he attempted the recuperation (as he called it) of the pontifical authority in the Duchy of Spoleto, the March of Ancona, and Romagna, adducing as a juridical title, over and above the ancient pontifical rights, a testament of Henry VI's, of doubtful authenticity. But the cities, though in full agreement with him in the matter of expelling the Germans, consented only to a partial recognition of the Papal government. In Tuscany his claims, which were based merely on the testament of Matilda, had an even less favourable reception; the Tuscan League accepted only a vague protectorate on the part of the pontiff, who appealed to national sentiment and to the interests of Italy as a whole. "Which country," he said, "the pontiff should consider before all others." In the kingdom of Sicily the national party, though favoured by the queen-mother Constance, had nevertheless revolted, expelling the Germans. Constance recognized the feudal overlordship of the pontiff, repudiated the Empire on behalf of Frederick, and concluded a concordat by which the monarchy abandoned the very extensive rights (*monarchia sicula*) which the Norman kings, in the quality of Papal legates, had exercised in the ecclesiastical ordering of the kingdom. Constance died rather suddenly (1198), leaving the regency of the kingdom to Innocent III (Frederick was born—at Jesi—in 1194). Innocent did his utmost to exercise an effective tutelage, but he was quite unable to overcome the opposition and the anarchical rivalry of foreign and native *signori*, which were aggravated by the intervention of the maritime republics of Pisa and Genoa, which had great commercial interests in Sicily, whose harbours were ports of call for the Eastern trade. The Germans, though defeated in Sicily, had the upper hand on the mainland, under the leadership of Marcovald, who had retreated from Central Italy into his county of Molise. Innocent III gave assistance to his enemy, a French feudatory, Gautier Count of Brienne, who was a kinsman of Tancred. Gautier procured

the victory of the pontifical faction in Apulia, but Marcovald, with the help of the Pisans, subdued almost the whole of Sicily, and even took possession of the king, assuming the role of guardian. On his death (1202) the Archbishop of Palermo, Chancellor of the kingdom, succeeded him in the government. In the meantime the Genoese had made themselves the masters of Syracuse (1199). They were afterwards confirmed in their possession of the city by Frederick II, but deprived of it in 1221. On the mainland the power had been seized by the German Count Diepold of Acerra.

Innocent III had intervened in the German election—of course, against Philip and in favour of Otto—but when Philip was elected he entered into negotiations with him. When Philip was killed in a private vendetta (1208), and Otto IV was acknowledged by all, he made the most generous concessions to the pontiff, both in respect of ecclesiastical administration and in connection with the claims to temporal power in Italy. However, on entering Italy, where he was crowned Emperor (1209), he laid claim to full imperial rights in Central Italy, in the patrimony of St. Peter, and in the kingdom of Sicily, of which he occupied the continental portion. Innocent III thereupon excommunicated him (1210), absolving his subjects from their oath of fealty, incited the Lombard and Tuscan Leagues against him, and by agreement with Philip Augustus promoted the candidature of Frederick to the German crown. Frederick, having promised the Pope and the Sicilian barons that he would never unite the two crowns of Germany and Sicily, proceeded to Germany and was crowned at Mainz (1212). Otto, having also returned from Italy, involved Central and Western Europe in a war which was decided against him by the battle of Bouvines, near Lille (1214), in which he was defeated by the King of France. Taking refuge in his fiefs of Brunswick, he died there in 1218. In 1215 Frederick had been crowned a second time, having previously confirmed Otto's concessions to the pontiff, while he also recognized the pontifical suzerainty over Corsica and Sardinia.

At this period Upper Italy appears to have been divided between the Guelf and Ghibelline factions; and these names were now permanently adopted. In reality there were a number of local conflicts between opposing groups of cities. At the head of the Guelf party

was Milan, still opposed by Cremona, Pavia, and the Marquis of Monferrato. In the Veronese March and Romagna both parties were struggling for the upper hand, with the help of such feudatories as Ezzelino II ("the Monk") and the Marquis Azzo d'Este, one being the leader of the Guelfs and the other of the Ghibellines. In Tuscany also, in Florence, the two factions made their appearance in 1215, actually deriving from private quarrels between the nobles, while the commune extended its power over such great feudal magnates as the lords of Casentino. When the Guelf Otto opposed the Pope, and the latter supported the Ghibelline Frederick, there was great confusion in the parties; Milan was faithful to the dynastic criterion, and therefore to Otto, while Pavia took the part of Frederick. On the other hand, in the Veronese March Azzo declared for Frederick and Ezzelino for Otto. Frederick found great difficulty in making his way from Genoa, through Pavia, Cremona, Mantua and Verona, into Germany, owing to the opposition of Milan, which had not changed its allegiance, despite the intimations of the Lateran Council and the Papal interdict. At this moment Milan had allies in the Count of Savoy, Crema, Piacenza, Lodi, Vercelli, Novara, Tortona, Como and Alessandria; while Asti, Pavia, Cremona, Parma, Reggio and Modena were of the other party. The two factions actually fought each other within the city walls in Verona and Ferrara; in Verona the Ezzelini opposing the Count of San Bonifacio, while in Ferrara Salinguerra and the Marquis d'Este contended for power.

§45. COMMUNAL DEVELOPMENTS.—The twenty years which elapsed between the death of Henry VI and the final triumph of Frederick II constituted, for the Italian communes, the decisive period of their effective liberation from the Empire, while it was also of great significance in respect of communal expansion and internal transformations. In Piedmont (the name makes its appearance in the first half of the 13th century, being applied to a narrow strip of territory between the Po, the Sangone and the Alps) the feudal regime was still particularly powerful. The great feudatory was the Marquis of Monferrato, ruling the country (apart from the three normal intersections of his territory by other domains of various categories) between the

Po and the upper reaches of the Tanaro and the Bormida. He had for neighbours, and often for enemies, the Counts of Savoy, probably of Burgundian origin, who had made their appearance, early in the 11th century, with Humbert I (Biancamano), Count of Aosta and Maurienne (in the valley of the Isère). His son Odo, by his marriage with the Marchioness Adelaide of Turin (§ 29), acquired extensive domains in Piedmont, a great part of which were subsequently lost. In the days of Barbarossa the head of the house was Humbert III (the Blessed), who left the domains of his house greatly diminished and in a sorry condition. But its fortunes were restored by his son Thomas I (*d.* 1233), whom Frederick II made imperial vicar in Piedmont. In addition to these two magnates there were a number of lesser feudatories, such as the Marquises of Saluzzo and Ceva. About 1200, however, there was a great efflorescence of communal life even in Piedmont; more especially in Turin, Asti and Alessandria. Asti was then the centre of a flourishing trade with Transalpine Europe.

We have seen how the communal regime developed in Tuscany; but in Romagna and the Marches also civic life was evolving even in the smallest cities. Bologna led the way in Romagna; and in the Marches Ancona, which the Arab geographer Idrisi described, in the second half of the 12th century, as one of the metropolises of the Christian world. In Umbria the leading city was Perugia, adjacent to Tuscan territory and in close relations with Tuscany; then came Assisi, Foligno, Spoleto, Terni, Todi. In Northern Latium Viterbo was predominant.

It must not be supposed that the formation of the Norman kingdom led to the disappearance of communal life. In Southern Italy the communes existed side by side with the feudal *signori*, and in a General Assembly held by Innocent III in San Germano (Cassino) in 1208 the pontiff negotiated with them and sought to obtain their support for Frederick. Even in the south the cities appointed magistrates, seeking to substitute their jurisdiction for that of the feudatories, and made war among themselves. Still greater was the autonomy of the communes in Sicily, where besides the great communes, such as Palermo, Messina, Catania, and Syracuse, there were smaller communes like Nicosia, Caltagirone and Piazza Armerina. In all parts of Italy the



cities were expanding and enlarging their walls, owing to the natural increase of their population, and because for political and economic reasons both *signori* and labourers flocked in from the countryside. The liquidation of the feudal system was proceeding on a large scale. Not only did the feudatories make submission to the communes, taking the oath of fealty to them, and coming to reside within the walls of the city: they were also losing their vassals and their bondsmen, since the political and economic influence of the communes was making for the liberation of both. The vassals became free citizens; the *adscripti glebae* and the colonists liable to personal prestations were transformed into tenants who paid their rent in money only.

But this did not mean that feudalism disappeared entirely. Many feudal islands remained, especially in mountainous localities, such as the Alpine regions, the Apennines of Tuscany and Romagna, and Lunigiana. Here we have a juxtaposition and a superimposition of politico-social forms rather than a radical disappearance of old forms in favour of new. There were feudatories who intervened in the internal conflicts of the cities, or in the conflicts between city and city, becoming citizen *podestà*, and leading the Guelf and Ghibelline leagues of citizens. There could still be, especially in the smaller cities, a combination of feudal, episcopal and communal powers. Here too feudalism had disappeared, which does not mean that the nobility had vanished, or that there was a final levelling of class differences. On the contrary, about 1200 a process was in full swing by which the commune, which signified, in the beginning, the union of the citizens, was beginning to split up into opposing groups. The nobility was obtaining reinforcements, as the urban nobility, which had taken the chief part in the foundation of the commune, was being reinforced by the rural nobles, who entered the cities as forced or voluntary immigrants, and also by families of the ennobled upper middle class. Within the urban limits, in the neighbourhood of the "quarters" and in the safety of their fortified palaces, the factions of the nobility waxed in power and aspired to dominion over the city. The wealthy middle class, in its turn, as its strength was increased by economic developments, reinforced its own organizations (*societates mercatorum*) and sought to take part in the government of the city through its

own officials (*consules mercatorum*). In addition to the already existing *arti* others were called into being in consequence of technical and economic differentiation, and also by the progress of the class of small artisans, or, as we should say, of the lower middle class; so that the *arti* came to be divided into greater, intermediate, and lesser. There were thus at least three competing classes: but by the beginning of the 13th century we see that a political dualism was prevalent, the nobles or *milites* being opposed to the people or *pedites*; whether the upper middle class supported the nobles against the lower middle class, or whether the latter, becoming the "clients" of the *milites*, were opposed to the *pedites*, who represented the upper middle class. These parties set up organizations which formed a state within the state; *commune militum*, *commune peditum*.

These intestine conflicts, which often ended in the expulsion of one of the parties from the city, marked a crisis in the history of the original commune, and a development which led to some sort of proportional representation of the classes and parties. An attempt was made to solve the problem by replacing the "collegiate" or party government by a single government under the control of an alien magistrate, above the parties: the *podestà*. Here the communes were adopting an institution of the Empire, with the radical difference that the official was appointed by the citizens themselves, and not by an external authority. At first the *podestà* appeared at intervals, alternating with the consuls, or there were consuls as well as a *podestà*; but in the end he definitely took the place of the consuls. On the other hand, the deliberative councils of citizens remained, and again took part in the government of the city, together with the representatives of the *arti*. From the first it sometimes happened that the bishop of the city was appointed *podestà*, either because he had succeeded in making peace between the parties, or because the latter had spontaneously appealed to him as arbitrator. Afterwards it became the custom to appoint a *podestà* from the outer world, as a guarantee of greater impartiality; generally from the caste of nobles, either because it was easier to find qualified and available persons in this caste (and in the economic crisis of the nobility the office of *podestà* meant for many nobles a means of livelihood), or because the middle class, being in power,

was divided into hostile factions, so that the nobleman was preferred as a member of another class. Just at first there were sometimes actually two or more rival *podestà*, each of the parties appointing its own.

Another frequent cause of conflict at this period was furnished by the relations between the clergy and the commune. The commune was often constituted by despoiling the bishop of his comital or semi-comital power; and to this the bishops ended by resigning themselves more or less readily. But even when this spoliation had been accomplished, the bishop still exercised his feudal powers over his fiefs and vassals, in the city and without—and the same thing applied to other ecclesiastical institutions (chapters and monasteries). Consequently, in their elimination of feudalism, the communes were attacking the institutions of the Church. Lastly—not unconnected with feudalism, but distinct from it in principle, so that they could not without more ado be liquidated together with feudalism—there were the ecclesiastical privileges of exemption from taxes, and the separate tribunal, or *foro ecclesiastico*. Without absolutely repudiating the principle of exemption, the communes endeavoured to restrict its scope, subjecting the clergy to extraordinary taxation (which in those days meant direct taxation), and extending the communal jurisdiction to the clergy in civil causes in which a layman was involved, and at all events in respect of the more serious criminal offences. Hence arose numerous and indeed almost habitual conflicts between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, often resulting in excommunication or the episcopal or papal interdict on the one hand, and on the other (in cases of a more serious nature), in the expulsion of the clergy, or perhaps a mere civil boycott: § 36).

The commune, therefore, though divided into hostile factions and opposing organizations, did not abandon the ideal of a single authority. On the contrary: becoming more conscious of its own authority, it manifested that authority in statutory legislation. This legislation developed, as the first phase of local autonomy, out of the practices in force at the beginning of the revival of civic life; but its scope and significance were entirely changed, for in place of regulations binding upon particular groups or cases, whose public value proceeded from the acknowledgement of external authorities, or merely from prescription, there was now a definite intention to decree, as the sovereign

authority, the privileges and duties of officials and citizens. The starting-point of the communal statutes was the *Brevia* or *Capitula* containing the formulae of the oaths to be administered by the consuls. To these were added, little by little, other rules relating to the constitution of the commune, to public life, and even to private justice. This statutory legislation reached its full development in the 13th and 14th centuries.

Where statutory law was not established the law in force for all, without distinction of persons—the *jus commune*—was the Roman law. While in the preceding century this had constituted an obstacle to the development of the communes, owing to the rigid interpretation of the rights of the Empire, now that the institution of the commune was recognized by the Emperor the resort to Roman law was advantageous to the commune, as it confirmed the ideal of a legislation which would be valid for all, and placed the refinements of the Roman institutes and Roman jurisprudence at the service of a richer and more complex economic life, in respect of which the old Lombard and Frankish laws, or the feudal laws and customs, were no longer adequate.

§ 46. ITALIAN MULTIPLICITY AND UNITY.—The communes, while the motive behind their internal conflicts was to establish the sovereign authority of the civic organism, surrendered to the urgency of their political and economic interests, making war upon the surrounding communes, because war, in the absence of an effective superior power, seemed to be the only means of solving the questions arising between institutions of equal authority. But we have already considered (§ 41) the motives of these inter-communal wars. As the political and economic life of the communes gained in amplitude, so the rivalry and enmity between city and city increased. Hence the formation of alliances and leagues of hostile cities, which expressed the need, both actual and theoretical, of a unifying principle and a superior power from which support might be obtained. The practical result was these civic conflicts took place within the framework of the Guelf and Ghibelline factions. The initial adhesion of a city to the one party rather than to the other might depend on a number of

different causes; original agreement with or hostility to the Empire, the prevalence of this or that social element, or of this or that noble family, in the civic life of the community. Above all, the adhesion of the more important and mutually hostile cities to the Guelph or Ghibelline faction naturally led to the formation of a following of lesser cities, their allies and dependants. In respect of the two great universal institutions of the Middle Ages, the Church and the Empire, the Italian people came to assume the existence of a similar but extremely complex attitude on the part of both, an attitude compounded of profound interest, of the close bond by virtue of which both institutions were felt to be in a special relation to Italy, and at the same time of many causes of conflict. In this connection the Guelph and Ghibelline parties assumed a significance which was far in excess of the importance of the internal conflicts between city and city. Guelfism embodied, in some degree, the national opposition to the intervention of the Empire in Italian affairs; and Ghibellinism the lay opposition to the intervention of the Church in temporal affairs. Neither party proceeded to the extreme consequences of its attitude. Both helped to give Italian history and Italian thought a universal character, and to make Italy the ideal centre of European history in the late Middle Ages.

And here we are confronted with a fact of capital importance in the history of communal Italy—which applied equally, *mutatis mutandis*, to the Italy of the feudal domains and principalities—namely, the fact that the Italian commune, while it tended toward political unity within its limits, and in some degree realized this unity, did not envisage the problem of complete autonomy, of an existence totally *sui juris*. The Italian cities never had the courage, or never felt the need, to assert their own complete and absolute independence in respect of the Empire, definitely opposing to the principle of imperial authority the principles of the sovereignty of the people and of national independence. The importance of this fact becomes more clearly evident when we compare Italy with France, where the king, the leader of the nation, was explicitly proclaimed “the emperor of his land”: that is, not subject to any earthly power. Since the communes—and later on, the Italian principalities—never reached this stage of political and national

consciousness, the predominant influences were the imperial ideal, and Roman tradition, or what was believed to be Roman tradition. But they were influenced in an equal degree by the actual circumstances which had already distinguished the history of Italy from that of other countries. The King of France might proclaim himself "emperor in his own country"; but in Italy there was no king who could say as much, or rather this king was identified—with the King of Germany and Emperor. The Empire, for the Italians, played the part of the unifying principle which in other countries resided in the monarchy and the national dynasty; and in opposition to the Empire the Papacy exercised a similar function, serving as a point of reference and a theoretical justification for those who for any reason did not find it expedient to appeal to the imperial power, and were therefore obliged to oppose it. The two institutions, Papacy and Empire, by their universal character, by their fundamental extraneousness to Italian life, were not adapted to perform the function which was expected of them; and as a matter of fact the Italian autonomies were continually alternating between invocations to these powers and rebellion against them. Nevertheless, the fact remains that so long as this function was required of them, and assumed by them, no other powers arose to take their place. The shattering of Italian unity, and the failure to constitute a single and autonomous Italic kingdom—that is, the peculiar vicissitudes of Italy from the 6th to the 9th century—resulted in such a multiplicity of political formations within the confines of the peninsula that it was impossible for any one of them to triumph over all the rest. The very complexity of political and cultural life, which constituted the great glory of Italy, and the foundation of her mission in Europe, was an obstacle to political unification. The federative principle, which created Switzerland and the Low Countries, and which had its applications even in Italy in the 12th and 13th centuries, might have offered a way of escape from the enclosing circle. But in the communal period the multiplicity of civic centres, the entanglement of interests, the lack of the natural conditions for a division into cantons, prevented the development of this principle, and kept the whole political life of Italy in a state of fluidity. Italy was too much a

unity to permit of rigid divisions and too manifold for a unitary or a merely uniform constitution.

This does not mean that there was not, even at this period, an Italian nation; for we must not confuse the concept of the nation with that of the State, still less with that of unitary State. The nuclei of political life constituted by the Italian cities, and later by the principalities, were not so alien to one another as are different states and nations. If we would deny that it is possible to speak of a history of Italy in the communal era—claiming that there is only a history of Milan, of Florence, of Pisa, and so forth—we should have to disregard the difference between the mutual relations of the Italian communes, even when they were at war with one another, and the relations between France and England, France and Germany, in the same historic period. We have only to make the comparison in order to be convinced that there is such a thing as the political history of Italy. The Italian communes were perfectly well aware that they belonged to one and the same nation. Beyond the internal political life specific to each commune, beyond the conflicts of commune and commune, there was unity of blood, of language, of culture, of family, of economic, political and religious life.

Nor must we exaggerate the scope and the gravity of the frequent and complicated communal wars, for they were not so very deadly. Sometimes they continued for years, but they were for the most part confined to raids and skirmishes, while the prisoners were far more numerous than the dead, and were promptly ransomed. The civic conflicts were marked by greater ferocity; for it is a well-known fact that neighbours and acquaintances hate one another more bitterly than strangers from a distance. But the very structure of the cities, where the factions were close-packed in their towers and palaces, which were so many stone fortresses, did not lend itself to hecatombs; and hostilities ended in the exodus and banishment of one of the parties, which found hospitality in the fortresses, or in some neighbouring city, and before very long (at all events in the early communal period) their opposition was condoned, and they were repatriated. Without the city and within, peace was concluded as quickly and readily as war had been declared; discord was soon followed by reconciliation,

even though this was followed by fresh hostilities and fresh reconciliations; the ideal of peace and concord was always present in men's minds. And it cannot be said that there was any profound moral disunion between the contending parties, such as we find to-day between peoples and social classes. Cities and parties contended for precise, restricted and material interests, and not because of irreconcilable spiritual differences arising from opposing ideals and religions. Municipal patriotism was not a fanatical religion, nor did the professions of the parties lay claim to the infallibility of the Papal anathema. The moral and intellectual life was not restricted to the narrow confines of the party or the city, and transcending the political activity of the city there was its economic life, the life of the family, the arts, and religion. The citizens of the Italian communes often fought one another, both within the city and without, but even as they fought they had much the same feelings, the same beliefs. Religion and country, knightly honour and family virtue, art and poetry were common values, similarly conceived and professed with equal zeal. The Italy of the 12th and 13th centuries, though infinitely divided in the material sense, constituted a profound moral unity.

§ 47. ARTS AND LETTERS IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE 13TH CENTURY.—The flourishing condition of the Italian cities during this period is evidence that the continual wars did not have very serious consequences. Their demographic and economic growth was manifested by their activity in the erection of public buildings, in which the artists co-operated (in the first half of the 13th century Italian art was still Romanic), for the intimate relationship between culture and civic life was characteristic of the age. Cathedrals were built or restored, and they were manifestations of civic life no less, but even more, than of ecclesiastical life. The cathedral of Cremona was consecrated in 1190, and beside it rose the octagonal baptistery, begun in 1167. In Verona the Duomo was completed in 1187; the even more splendid San Zeno about 1200. The cathedral of Borgo San Domino—a little city which has left us one of the most glorious examples of Romanic art—was begun in 1207. In Pisa Diotisalvi's circular baptistery rose beside the cathedral in 1153. The Duomo of



Lucca was rebuilt about the beginning of the 13th century, and San Michele, whose interior was completed in 1143, was faced with marbles in the following century. In Pistoia San Giovanni Fuorcivitas and San Bartolomeo in Pantano, with their sculptural decorations, were built in the second half of the 12th century. At Assisi Giovanni da Gubbio's new cathedral of San Rufino rose in the middle of the century; in Ancona the cathedral of San Ciriaco, with its central cupola, shows the influence of Byzantine art. In Rome the basilical style still found expression in Santa Maria in Trastevere, built between 1190 and 1198. In Southern Italy the Apulian school of architecture continued to flourish. About the end of the 12th and the beginning of the 13th century the cathedrals of Bitonto, Trani and Ruvo were built. In Sicily the architectural glories of the reign of Roger II included the cathedral of Palermo, consecrated in 1185, and the Duomo of Monreale, founded in 1176.

And now began the flourishing period of civil architecture. Even the gates and towers of the new walls possessed artistic value, as was shown in the second half of the 12th century by Porta Nuova in Milan and the keep of Como. At the end of the 12th century the Palazzo del Comune was erected in Verona, and in the first decades of the 13th century the Palazzo della Ragione in Milan.

At the close of the 12th and the beginning of the 13th century Romanic sculpture reached its apogee in Italy. It did not undergo an isolated development, seeking its end in itself, but evolved in close relation to ecclesiastical and civil architecture. Thus, we have the statues decorating the Duomo of Modena, the Duomo of Borgo San Donnino, and San Zeno in Verona, and the equestrian statue of the *podestà* Oldrado on the façade of the Palazzo della Ragione in Milan. The sculpture of the cathedrals combined evangelical and hagiographic themes with representations of the life of nature and scenes of everyday life. First among the sculptors of this period were Vili-gelmo and Nicolo (in the first half of the 12th century). About 1200 the great personality of Benedetto Antelami of Parma emerges, the "Michelangelo of young Italy," whose work was marked by the restrained and powerful expression of a profoundly religious and moral nature.

The 12th century witnessed a great revival of Latin literature, which no longer consisted of dreary repetitions of ancient forms, or crude compilations for immediate needs, but was an adequate expression of a new moral and intellectual life. In France it was largely theological, philosophical and exegetical in character, in accordance with the contemporary direction of French culture, whose centre was the University of Paris. In Italy also this scientific literature brought forth some characteristic products. A systematization of the doctrines of the Church which might be described as juridical was accomplished by Peter the Lombard (c. 1100–1160), born in the neighbourhood of Novara, who studied first at Bologna and then in France, at Reims and in Paris, where he was afterwards professor in the episcopal school of Notre-Dame. While there he edited his writings and became Bishop of Paris. His four *Libri sententiarum* (c. 1150) contain a systematic exposition of the dogmas of the Church, with proofs derived from Holy Scripture and the tradition of the Fathers, difficulties being eliminated by dialectic. This work, which is really an example of French rather than Italian culture, was universally diffused and provoked a series of commentaries. At the opposite extreme, and much more intimately connected with the religious life of Italy, we find a turbulent current of prophetic thought and feeling in the works of the Calabrian monk Gioacchino di Fiore (d. 1202), a Cistercian; chief among them being the *Liber concordiae novi ac veteris Testamenti*, the *Psalterium decem chordarum*, and the *Expositio Apocalypsis*, in which, by the medium of an allegorical exegesis, a total reformation of the Church is foretold, and the advent of a new era, that of the Holy Spirit. The effect of Gioacchino's work was slight at first, but very great in the second half of the 13th century, when it influenced the Franciscan movement. Tommaso Gallo di Vercelli, at the beginning of the 13th century, diffused the mystical doctrines of the Pseudo-Dionysian Areopagita, founding the mysticism of the French school of St. Victor, and building a bridge to that of St. Bonaventura and the German mystics. Innocent III, on the other hand, in his *De contemptu mundi*, did not exceed the limits of ordinary asceticism, while the outline sermons of St. Anthony of Padua (d. 1231) did not depart from the norms of the ordinary ecclesiastical rhetoric, with its foun-

dation of allegory. We find the transition from theological to moral literature in the work of the judge Albertano of Brescia (*d.* after 1240), the author of a *De amore Dei*, but also of a *Liber consolationis*, which introduces Prudence as a teacher of mankind, and of *De arte loquendi et tacendi*.

The literary productions most characteristic of the Italian genius were of other categories, and mainly historical. Here too there was no lack of compilations, starting with the creation of the world, such as the poem of Goffredo di Viterbo (a contemporary of Barbarossa and Henry VI, and of German origin), entitled *Pantheon*, or the *Chronicon* of Sicard, Bishop of Cremona, which came down to the year 1213, and the *Chronicon Fossae Novae*, which ended with the year 1217. But even in these compilations more space was devoted to recent or contemporary events. We find an actual treatment of a contemporary subject in the *Gesta Friderici*—also by Goffredo—a series of poems in hexameters, and above all in the anonymous poem, *Gesta Friderici I*, which deals with events between 1152 and 1160; this was the work of a cleric, a partisan of the Emperor's, who was familiar with the epic poetry of the ancients, and especially with Virgil. The poem is accurate in form, both metre and prosody being very correct. Events in Lombardy during the reign of Barbarossa are vividly related in *De rebus laudensibus*, mainly the work of two noblemen of Lodi, Ottone and Acerbo Morena, and continued by a third anonymous writer. But in all the Italian communes there was at this time a sudden crop of historical works (annals) relating the events of communal history. Thus, there were the *Annales Mutinenses veteres* (1131–1336), the *Mantuani*, the *Placentini Guelfi* (in the first half of the 13th century), the *Parmenses minores* and *maiores*, the *Annales Pisani*, and the *Chronicon Faventinum* of the Canon of Toulouse (*d.* 1226). The most famous of all these chronicles was the Genoese Annals of Caffaro (1099–1163), which were kept in the public archives of Genoa, and continued by various hands as an official historiography. In Southern Italy Ugo Falcando wrote the *Liber de segno Siciliae* (1154–1169); Pedro d'Eboli, an ecclesiastic in touch with Henry VI, told in the poem *Liber ad honorem Augusti* the story of the conquest of the kingdom of Sicily by the Emperor, and wrote a pane-

gyric of Henry, producing a work of great rhetorical excellence. Bishop Romuald II of Salerno (d. 1181) was another annalist. In all these works there is frequent evidence of a lively interest in the facts narrated, and a genuine and individual expression of party feeling. This revelation of personal interest is even more characteristic when the writer describes and exalts his own city and narrates its history; thus, Moses of Bergamo dedicated his *Liber Pergaminus* to his city; and in Rome, about 1150, was compiled that famous work, the *Mirabilia Romae*, in which the description of Rome is intermingled with Roman legends. It should be noted, on the other hand, that Italy did not contribute to the history of the Crusades which had sprung up beyond the Alps and overseas.

In respect of Italian literature properly so-called the great importance attributed to the art of rhetoric is shown by the works on the *Artes dictandi*, which were especially numerous in Italy. We may mention the works of Canon Ugo of Bologna (c. 1125) and Guido Fava (first half of the 13th century)—noting that the latter already includes Italian texts in his examples—and Boncompagno da Signa. An interest in moral questions, combined with imitations of the literary tradition of the classics (and especially of Boetius), characterizes the elegy (1193), *De diversitate fortunae et philosophiae consolatione*, of Arrigo di Settimello.

In the first half of the 13th century—later than in other Romanic countries, no doubt by reason of the greater vitality of the Latin tradition in Italy—the literature of the vulgar tongue made its appearance. Among its most venerable monuments is the *Cantico delle creature* (more commonly known as the *Cantico del Sole*, the Hymn to the Sun) of St. Francis of Assisi (§ 49), a typical manifestation of his piety. Almost at the same time, in the court of Frederick II, the earliest school of Italian lyrical poetry emerged, the so-called Sicilian school, which imitated Provençal models.

§ 48. THE UNIVERSITIES AND THE INFLUENCE OF ARISTOTLE.  
—Two important events characterized and encouraged the renewal of mediaeval culture in the 12th century: the constitution of the universities, and the reappearance, in the world of mediaeval know-

edge, of Greek philosophy and Greek scientific literature, in the form of Latin translations. In both these events Italy played a leading part.

The universities had their origin in the groups of scholars who gathered about the more famous teachers—both teachers and scholars being now very largely laymen. In the beginning there was usually but one faculty, or subject of study, in each locality: in Paris, for example, theology; in Bologna, jurisprudence; in Salerno, medicine. From the union of these three faculties with that of the Arts, which comprised the seven liberal arts and philosophy, arose the *Studi generali* or Universities. It was left to the students themselves to organize themselves in corporations, and to choose (at all events, at first) their professors and rectors, who controlled even their life outside the schools, for the students enjoyed the privilege of a special tribunal. These corporations were originally of a private character, but at an early stage the Church, the State, and the communes intervened. Although they were under the control of the ecclesiastical authorities, while theology was the first among the subjects taught—and its teaching was subordinated to Catholic dogma—the Universities constituted a great step toward the secularization of culture. They were no longer schools for the clergy; they resulted from the reunion of professional teachers, even laymen, with the students, and besides theology the profane sciences were taught, and these reverted to the classic tradition. First among these profane sciences was that of the law. Bologna tried in vain to secure a monopoly of juridical instruction, prohibiting her doctors from teaching elsewhere. Schools of law, which were afterwards expanded into universities, arose in Modena, Padua, Pisa, Rome, and Perugia. The University of Naples, established in 1224, was, unlike those already mentioned, of royal origin, being founded by Frederick II. The law and medicine were always favourite subjects of study in Italy. In Bologna, after the four successors of Irnerius, of whom we have already spoken (§ 41), and deriving from two of these teachers, there were the schools of the Bulgarians and the Gosiani. At the beginning of the 13th century there was a very famous teacher in Bologna: Azzone (*d.* 1230), of whom it was said “chi non ha azzo, non vada a palazzo.” A compilation of all the glosses—which were still the principal form of textual commentary—was made by the

Florentine Francesco Accursio (1182–1260), and was known as the *Glossa ordinaria*.

As against Roman law, its rival, canon law, was beginning to be largely employed in Italy. Compilations were made supplementary to the *Decreto* of Gratian, in which the later decretals of the pontiffs were collected. Official compilations of this kind were made at the instance of Innocent III and Honorius III, until Gregory IX made a collection of the decretals in five volumes (1234), which he sent to Bologna as the supreme standard of law. Among the glossographers and compilers who busied themselves with Gratian and the texts of Roman law were Ognibono of Bologna (*d.* 1185), Albert of Benevento, afterwards Gregory VIII (*d.* 1187), Sicard of Cremona (§ 47), and Ugucione, Bishop of Ferrara (*d.* 1210).

The medical school of Salerno produced manuals, translations of and commentaries on the classic texts, the work of Arcimatto and Mauro di Salerno, Pietro di Musanda, and Romuald. There were also surgical authors: thus, Roger of Palermo wrote a *Practica chirurgiae*. There were likewise manuals of pharmacology, such as the *Tabula salernitana* of a *magister Salernus*. Salerno, however, was unable to preserve its monopoly of medical teaching: even under Honorius III there was a flourishing school of medicine in Bologna.

Cultural results of a general character followed upon the reconquest of Aristotle, for this opened to the mediaeval Occident a new world of thought, independent of Christian revelation and theology. As a matter of fact, in the first few decades of the 13th century Aristotelism was opposed by the Church; but before long there was a *rapprochement*, a reconciliation, and it was absorbed into the general theological and philosophical thought of the period. Nevertheless, rationalism had made a contribution to the culture and the mental habits of the age.

Aristotle became known through Latin translations; and these were made either from the Arabic translations, or directly from the Greek. Translations of the first kind were made in Spain; especially by a group of scholars which had foregathered in Toledo. One of the most active of these was an Italian, Gerard of Cremona (*d.* 1186), who translated various works of Aristotle; and also scientific and medical

texts, such as the *Canon* of Avicenna, a classic of mediaeval medicine, and the *Almagest* of Ptolemy, which was equally fundamental for astronomy. It may be that he was responsible for the Latin translation from the Arabic of the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle; and that famous neo-Platonic work (attributed at first to Aristotle), the *Liber de causis*, was certainly translated by Gerard.

Of the direct translations from the Greek, many were made in Sicily. About the middle of the 12th century an Archdeacon of Catania, Enrico Aristippo, made translations from Aristotle. Another translation from the Greek made in Sicily (before it was translated by Gerard from the Arabic) was the *Megale Syntaxis* (*Almagest*) of Ptolemy. The works of Euclid also were translated. In the reign of King Manfred Bartolomeo of Messina translated the *Magna Moralia*, attributed to Aristotle. In the middle of the 12th century three learned Italians were making translations from the Greek: Moses of Bergamo, of whom we have already spoken, Jacopo of Venice, who made translations from Aristotle, and Burgundio of Pisa, who translated works of the Greek Fathers (John Chrysostom, John of Damascus), and also interpreted the Greek passages of the Pandects.

§ 49. RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS. HERESIES, THE FRANCISCAN MOVEMENT, AND THE MENDICANT ORDERS.—The existence of certain elements of secularism and rationalism in the new culture did not mean that the latter was alienated from religion, and still less that it was hostile to it; but they did help to make it more independent of tradition and of the hierarchy of the Church. In the whole history of Italy, there were no more religious centuries than the 12th and 13th; but their piety differed from that of the late Middle Ages. Men believed in God as firmly as in the latter period; but there had been a renewal of the *joie de vivre*, of the joy to be found in action; so that men were more conscious of God's presence in their life, in their daily activities. They prayed to Heaven as of old, but in fairer churches, and with more sumptuous rites; they invoked and honoured the Virgin and the Saints with undiminished fervour, but Jesus, the Virgin and the Saints were regarded less as the heavenly powers who would save them from the world and from life than as their helpers

and companions in their work and their daily life, and in their churches they did not seek an escape from life, but rather its continuation and exaltation. Religious faith found expression in practical morality, in everyday life: besides the monkish virtues of unity and penitence men began to honour the secular virtues of prudence, fortitude and justice, the benefactors and saviours and preceptors of the city-state and of social life.

The general attitude to the clergy, though they were still regarded as the transmitters of supernatural powers, was one of greater detachment and freer criticism. They were no longer, as of old, the sole and adequate interpreters of the spiritual life, in which faith and morality, ritual and practical life, society and religion were united. The lower ranks of the clergy had little authority and scant learning; oppressed as they were by the lay patrons who owned so many of the parochial churches, and often exploited by the bishops, there were numerous malcontents among them, so that anticlerical agitation found an echo in their midst. The higher clergy were engrossed in the tremendous and complicated task of administering the patrimonies of the Church, and in the conflicts between the bishops and the chapters (the property of which had been distributed in the form of prebends to the individual canons, the old canonical life having been abolished), between the secular and the regular clergy, and between the ecclesiastical and lay tribunals. Of necessity they did but little pastoral work, and their artificial and conventional sermons were still inspired by the spirit and the forms of the early Middle Ages, which were now antiquated and insufficient. Such sermons preached the transcendent immobility of the Divine, and inculcated the ascetic flight from the world, which was ruled by the Demon; never the fatherhood of God and the humanity of Jesus. The new generations found nothing here that was akin to their own confident activity, nothing to satisfy their aspirations. And if any remnant of the wise and vital Christian morality survived in such preaching, its efficacy was often diminished by the moral conduct of the clergy. Concubinage had not been eradicated, though the harem that used to accompany Christian, Archbishop of Mainz, one of Barbarossa's generals (§ 42), remained an exception. Clerics in lay garments, long-haired gamblers and usurers, were not



unknown; nor were monks who had fled from their monasteries with the funds of the community, and who now sought a living at court. Innocent III used to say that the sins of the people were derived from the sins of their pastors; and that an evil odour emanated even from so famous an abbey as Monte Cassino.

The religious Orders of this period did not suffice to fill the gap between clergy and people, nor to dissipate their mutual hostility. They too had many possessions, though the monasteries even more than the clergy suffered from the scanty revenues and nominal value of a good proportion of the estates in the hands of their vassals. These possessions of theirs, although actually collective property, made a bad impression on the multitude, and led to many conflicts of interest between the clergy and the laity. Greater austerity of life (though not always), an intense faith, a livelier and more sympathetic eloquence were found among the monks of the more recent Orders, above all among the Cistercians; but even they very soon became worldly; moreover, the general population, especially in the cities, cannot often have come into contact with the monks living in rural convents, or even in solitary places. The monk appeared to the people, even when his mode of life was perfectly respectable, a member of the aristocracy, so that in general he seemed even more alien and remote than the secular clergy. The lower ranks of the secular clergy were closer to the people; and often too close, for they shared in all the trivial amusements and dissipations of the people, and were not respected.

This hostile and critical attitude to the clergy was greatly aggravated, in the first half of the 12th century, by the communal controversies which were of almost daily occurrence. To such of the juridical, economic and military measures of the communes as encroached upon the privileges of the clergy the latter replied with spiritual censure, excommunication and interdict. Deprivation of the sacraments and banishment from religious functions afflicted the conscience of the faithful, and social life was depressed and impoverished by them; though little by little, as these acts of ecclesiastic censure became more numerous and frequent, they made less impression on the people and at the same time excited greater opposition. Pressure was brought to bear upon the local clergy to induce them to disregard the inter-

dict, and sometimes (as we have seen) consuls and *podestà* took measures of reprisal, forbidding the citizens to have any dealings with priests and bishops. They even discussed, in principle, such matters as the frontiers between civil and religious authority, the distinction between the spiritual and temporal powers of the Church, or the moral consequences and juridical foundations of earthly possessions in the hands of the clergy. In Rome, the people said, God was not Three in One, but Four. They remembered the saying of Jesus, "Render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's," the tribute which Christ bade Peter pay, the poverty of Jesus and the Apostles.

All these things, together with the nascent scientific spirit and the incipient secularization of culture, explain the success of the heretical movements. In the days of Arnold of Brescia (§ 40) the economic possessions and political power of the clergy had been opposed in principle and theory, and this opposition was related to the tendency to regard the efficacy of the sacraments as dependent upon the virtue and piety of the priests (a tendency encouraged, at the time of the War of Investitures, by the Roman decrees against clerical concubinage). Arnold was put to death, but his followers remained. Related to the latter, the sect of the Waldensians arose, born of the conflict between the evangelical ideals of poverty, humility, and apostleship, and the reality of the contemporary Church. They derived their name from Peter Waldes or Waldo, a wealthy merchant of Lyons, and an assiduous reader of the Bible, who on being converted to the ideal of evangelical poverty gave his possessions to the poor and began (1177) to travel about with a few companions in imitation of the Apostles, preaching repentance and reading the Bible. This little group styled itself the "Poor Men of Lyons," and their followers who remained in the world were known as "Friends." The Waldensians turned a deaf ear when they were forbidden to preach, and were excommunicated (1184). Their followers began to make confession to one another, though in other respects they remained Catholics. The movement spread through Southern Italy, giving rise to the *Poveri Lombardi*, who broke away from Waldo (c. 1210), professing more radical doctrines. They did not admit the validity of religious acts performed by unworthy priests; they formed a separate commu-

nity, dispensing the sacraments themselves, repudiating the Catholic rites, the cult of the saints and of images, the doctrine of purgatory, and indulgences.

This radicalism was not uninfluenced by the Cathar movement. The Cathars were of Eastern origin, and had attached themselves to a great religious movement which had emerged at the close of the 3rd century: namely, Manichaeism, which was based upon a strictly dualistic conception of the world, regarded as the arena of a deadly struggle between the two opposing principles of light and darkness. Manichaeism, suppressed and persecuted by the State, had not entirely disappeared, and from it emerged, in Asia, the sect of the Paulicians in the 7th century and that of the Bogomils in the 11th century. Transported to the Balkans by the Byzantine Emperors, the Bogomils diffused their ideas very widely among the Bulgars, and owing to the contacts resulting from commercial intercourse, the Crusades, etc., these ideas made their way into the West, where they gave rise to the sect of Cathars (from the Greek *katharòs* = pure). The Cathars conceived the life of the world as a struggle between good and evil. To combat the evil a rigorous asceticism was necessary (fasting, vegetarian diet, absolute chastity), which, however, was observed only by the class of the "perfect," and was not required of "believers," who constituted the majority. Admission to the ranks of the "perfect" was permitted only on receiving the "consolation," a sort of spiritual baptism, the only sacrament recognized by the Cathars. This was the necessary means of eternal salvation, and some persons, after receiving it, starved themselves to death. (This was known as "endurance.") The mere "believers" received the "consolation" on their deathbed. The *perfecti* constituted the hierarchy of the Cathar church, which was divided into bishops, ministers and deacons. The Old Testament, the Catholic sacraments, the saints, images, and temples were forbidden to the Cathars, as were the swearing of oaths, war, the death penalty, and civil authority. It was therefore a movement which overthrew the foundations of mediaeval society, all the more difficult to repress inasmuch as the "believers" continued to be members of the Catholic Church.

Catharism became very widely diffused in the south of France,

where the Cathars took the name of Albigenses (from the city of Alba) in the second half of the 12th century. At the beginning of the 13th century a crusade against them was organized by Innocent III. This crusade wrought the most terrible devastation in the south of France, and especially in Provence, where the gay and splendid courts of the feudal seigneurs, at which the troubadours had figured conspicuously, were left unpeopled. In Northern Italy also, and in communal Italy generally, the faith of the Cathars was widely diffused. In ecclesiastical documents of the first decades of the 13th century there are constantly recurring references to the struggle against the heretics. In this conflict the Papacy was supported by the Empire; Frederick Barbarossa imposed the ban of the Empire upon the heretics, while Frederick II sanctioned the infliction of the death penalty. The communal authorities were at first less zealous in suppressing heresy, either because they sympathized with the persecuted heretics, or because they were hostile to the clergy and opposed to ecclesiastical jurisdiction. However, as time went on they underwent conversion, and persecuted the Cathars. To this very day one may read on the façade of the Palazzo della Ragione in Milan the eulogy of the *podestà* Oldrado, who "Catharos ut debuit uxit."

Heretics sentenced to death were burned at the stake, a mode of punishment regularized by Frederick II and Gregory IX. The Church reserved to itself the trial and condemnation of the heretics, with the reservation that it consigned the condemned person to the civil authority for the execution of the capital sentence, in formal obedience to the canonical principle that "the Church abhors blood." For this work of repression it created a special organ, the Inquisition, which was merely a special application of the jurisdiction of the Church. The beginnings of the Inquisition date back to the end of the 12th century; the 4th Lateran Council decreed a number of rules for proceeding against the heretics (1215); but the definitive constitution of this tribunal was accomplished by the Council of Toulouse (1229). Until then it had been an organ of the episcopal jurisdiction; but Gregory IX transformed it into an institution immediately subject to the pontiff (1231), and thereafter it was entrusted almost exclusively to the mendicant Orders (*q.v.*), above all to the Dominicans. Here

again we have an instance of the increasing centralization of the Papacy.

The procedure of the Inquisition differed from that of the canon law. Sometimes the names of the witnesses were not revealed to the accused; the prisoner was not allowed an advocate, and torture was adopted (from 1250) as a means of obtaining confession. The heretic who retracted was granted his life, but was often sentenced to perpetual imprisonment. If he persisted in his error his property was confiscated—lapsing, partially at first, and afterwards in its entirety, to the Church—and he was burned at the stake by the secular authority.

There are references to the war upon the heretics in the contemporary Latin literature of Italy. Thus, Bonaccorso, a Cathar ex-bishop, wrote about 1190 a *Vita haereticorum*, attacking his former co-religionists; and the proceedings against the heretics were described by two Lombard Dominicans, Moneta of Cremona (*d.* 1235) and Raniero Sacconi (*d.* 1259), the latter being himself an inquisitor.

Notwithstanding all this machinery of repression, in the first decades of the 13th century the movement of opposition to the official Church in Italy—and also abroad—was so vigorous that the issue of the conflict would perhaps have been doubtful, if fresh creations of the religious spirit (nourished to some extent by a spirit analogous to that of the dissident movements) had not succeeded very largely in closing the gap between the Church and the people, at the same time placing under the immediate orders of the Pope new and strongly organized forces which had a very great influence over the people.

The Franciscan movement was inspired by a religious mentality akin to that of the early Waldenses. Francis of Assisi (1182–1226), the son of the wealthy merchant Bernadone, had led a gay and thoughtless life in his early youth; but in consequence of a profound religious crisis he renounced all his possessions, and in imitation of Christ he adopted, with a few companions, the life of a wandering preacher, living in complete poverty (1209). His preaching, whose principal themes were the love of God and one's neighbour, the renunciation of all enmity and hatred, and the contempt of riches, met with astonishing success, and the number of his followers continually increased. Notwithstanding the affinity of the movement with that of the Wal-

denses, Francis was an obedient son of the Church, and never dreamed of disputing her authority. The Church, therefore, had no difficulty in absorbing the movement—which, if left to itself, might have become dangerous—and transforming it into a valuable prop. Innocent III, without too greatly engaging himself, favoured the enterprise of Francis, who had given his companions—whom he called, in his humility, his “little brothers”—*fratelli minori*—a very simple Rule, based upon passages in the Gospels. In the beginning it was his intention to constitute merely a free community dedicated to the itinerant preaching of moral and religious truths, without fixed habitations, without even collective property, and without the exercise of sacerdotal functions. But the force of circumstances, and the skilful efforts of the Curia—especially of Cardinal Ugolino of Ostia (later Gregory IX), seconded by a Minorite, Brother Elias, a man of great schemes, with the temperament of a ruler—finally transformed the institution, despite the repugnance of its founder, into a true religious Order, whose Rule was approved by Honorius III (1223). After this transformation the *Minori* were no longer wandering preachers; they were gathered into convents and subordinated to a hierarchy which was directly dependent upon the pontiff, and they were supported no longer by their own labours—as had been the original intention of St. Francis—but by alms (hence their name of “Mendicant Order”) and donations. Francis died on the 3 October 1226, and the discovery of the “stigmata” immediately after his death still further increased the veneration of the people, whom Gregory IX hastened to gratify by canonizing the saint in 1228. The magnificent church which rose above his sepulchre, thanks to the efforts of Brother Elias, became one of the most famous sanctuaries of the age.

Even during the lifetime of its founder the Franciscan Order had begun to expand throughout Europe. After his death it continued to make rapid progress. From the very first there were two movements within the Order; those of one way of thinking were rigid in their observances, especially in respect of poverty, while the others were more disposed to adapt themselves, and also more ready to engage the Order in all kinds of ecclesiastical activities, including the teaching of theology. The latter were triumphant. Beside the masculine Order

rose another, feminine Order, known as the *Clarisse* or Poor Clares, founded by a noble maiden, St. Clara, a contemporary of Francis, who under his influence adopted a new way of life. Lastly, during the lifetime of the saint a pious community was founded, for those who wished to remain in the world, known as the *Terzo ordine* or Tertiaries of St. Francis, which formed a wider sphere of social influence, centred upon the Franciscan Order. (Cf. the Cathar "Believers" and the Waldensian "Friends.")

Contemporaneously with the Franciscan Order arose the other great mendicant Order of the Predicatori or *Domenicani*, founded in 1215 by a regular canon of Spanish nationality, St. Dominic (1170–1221), to make war upon the Albigensian heresy, and heretics in general. Even more than the Franciscan Order it found scope for its activities not only in preaching, but also in theology; and before long the two Orders were represented by their professors in the principal universities, beginning with that of Paris. The Dominicans also found a special sphere of activity in the Inquisition. Their Rule had at first been the Augustinian (so called because it was derived in some degree from St. Augustine), but St. Dominic himself, in 1220, transformed the Order into a mendicant Order like that of the Franciscans.

The influence of these two Orders on the life of the people was very great. Unlike the previous Orders, they existed in the midst of lay society, most of their converts being in the cities, and they acted as parochial clergy in their churches, which rivalled the cathedrals, and gave a fresh impulse to the development of religious architecture. Being immediately dependent upon the Holy See, which conferred many privileges upon them, the two Orders constituted a sort of Papal militia.

Of less importance, though widely diffused in Italy, were the other mendicant Orders: those of the Carmelites, founded in 1247, but whose origin dated back to the preceding century, and the *Agostiniani eremiti* or Heremite Augustinians (1250), so called to distinguish them from the regular Augustinian canons.

§ 50. ITALY IN THE MEDITERRANEAN.—In the 12th and 13th centuries the influence of Italy on European culture was still un-

developed. At this period France still held the foremost place both in science and in literature. None the less, Italian influences were already at work beyond the frontiers, but mainly in the economic sphere.

Italy, at this period, had outstripped all other countries in the matter of agriculture. This supremacy was due in equal measure to technical improvements and to social changes. The methods of agriculture were improved, great systems of irrigation were installed, and uncultivated land was prepared for tillage on a very large scale (not only by the Cistercians, but also by lay authorities). The extensive transformation of villeins into free cultivators, and the increasing security against feudal oppression, resulted in more willing and therefore more intensive and productive labour. Lombardy and Tuscany were already assuming the aspect of true models of agricultural exploitation; they were like flourishing gardens.

Italy at this period was the great centre of European commerce. She was pushing out across the Mediterranean, east and west, south and north; projecting into the inland sea, between the eastern and western basins, the country was a sort of *entrepôt* for European trade, while the Italian warships and trading vessels dominated the Mediterranean. The busiest and wealthiest port was Venice. As we have already seen, the Venetians brought woven fabrics and spices from the East, and exported them to the west and north of Europe. They dealt also in two other articles of prime necessity—corn and salt. Venice imported grain from Sicily and North Africa, at first for herself, but afterwards for re-export. She also attempted to establish a monopoly of trade with the other Italian cities of the Padanian plain, or at least to control prices, keeping them low. This gave rise to conflicts, even to war with the cities in question. Salt was obtained first from the Venetian lagoons, then from Istria, Dalmatia, Cervia near Ravenna, Sicily, Tripoli, and South Russia, and the city supplied the Italian and transalpine hinterland.

Its commercial interests led the Venetian Republic to practise an intensive policy of agreements to protect and favour its trade (exemptions from or reductions of customs duties, establishment of magazines, guarantees of security). This commercial policy was practised, above all, in connection with the Byzantine Empire. There Venice had a



number of establishments which amounted to actual colonies, subject to Venetian jurisdiction under conditions analogous to those of the modern capitulations and European concessions in Turkey, Egypt and China. The Greek reactions to these settlements were often violent, accompanied by the destruction of property, massacre, and warfare, but Venice always rebuilt what had been destroyed.

The other two great maritime cities, Pisa and Genoa, were especially active, until the close of the 11th century, in the central and western Mediterranean. From the beginning of the Crusades, however, they were no less busy than Venice in the eastern basin. The fleets of the three cities provided transport for the Crusaders, and at the same time defended the seas against the Musulman fleets. Great privileges were accordingly conceded to them in the Christian states of the Orient, and Venice, of course, already possessed such privileges in the Byzantine Empire. In those maritime cities of Syria which were held by the Christians, the three republics possessed not only trading concessions, harbours or landing-places, and warehouses, but whole settlements, subject to the jurisdiction of their own magistrates.

Venice attained the apogee of her Mediterranean supremacy and her expansion in the Orient with the Fourth Crusade. This was due to the initiative of Innocent III; and its object, like that of the Third Crusade, should have been the reconquest of Jerusalem. The leaders of the Crusaders, among whom was the Marquis Boniface of Monferrato, wishing to proceed to the Orient by sea, asked the Venetians to provide them with a fleet. The Venetians agreed to do so in exchange for a large sum of money and a share of the booty. As the Crusaders were unable to raise the sum required, the Doge Enrico Dandolo (1192-1205) offered to dispense with its payment if the Crusaders would co-operate in the conquest of Zara, which was engaging in piracy to the detriment of the Venetians, and the possession of which would assure Venice of the control of the Dalmatian coast. Although Innocent III endeavoured to dissuade the Crusaders from attacking a Christian city, Zara was besieged and taken (1202). The pontiff excommunicated the Venetians, but none the less the Crusade suffered a further and final diversion. The Emperor of Constantinople, Isaac Angelus, the brother-in-law of Philip of Swabia (§ 44), had been

dethroned. Isaac's son Alexius appealed to Philip and to the leaders of the expedition, asking them to help him to restore his father to the throne. The Doge Dandolo was strongly in favour of this plan, and in April 1203 the fleet set sail for the Aegean, dropping anchor off Constantinople in June. After a siege of thirteen days the city capitulated, and Isaac II was replaced on the throne, together with his son Alexius IV. But when the time came for the Byzantine sovereigns to fulfil their promises—which included the union of the Greek and Roman Churches—the people revolted, slew the two Emperors, and acclaimed Alexius V, the representative of the party which was in favour of war *à outrance* with the Latins (January 1204). The Latins again besieged the city, which they entered in April 1204. There was a great massacre of the Greeks, and an immense amount of booty was taken. It was then that the Venetians looted the famous quadriga of gilt bronze whose four horses still adorn the façade of St. Mark's. Dandolo might have allowed the Crusaders to proclaim him Emperor, but as he was unwilling a Latin Emperor was chosen in the person of Baldwin of Flanders. The provinces of the Empire were divided among the leading Crusaders as feudal dependencies: Boniface of Monferrato receiving the kingdom of Thessalonica (Salonica). To Venice were assigned a number of domains equivalent to three-eighths of the whole Empire. She did not take possession of all of them, while others were added subsequently: so that she obtained as her share Durazzo, the Ionian Islands, a few coastal strongholds in the Peloponnese, Euboea, most of the Aegean Islands, Candia, Gallipoli, with various strongholds in Thrace, and three-eighths of Constantinople.

Some of these possessions were granted to patricians, who held them in little more than nominal dependence on the Venetian government, although they introduced the laws and customs of Venice, and traded with the mother country. In Constantinople Venice was represented by the *bailo* or *podestà*, who was a kind of doge, assisted in the government, like the Doge of Venice, by a lesser and a greater council, with judges for civil and criminal causes, chamberlains in charge of the finances, and advocates to settle disputes with the fisc. The Patriarch at the head of the new episcopal hierarchy of the Latins

was likewise a Venetian. But this attempted Latinization of the Greek Church collapsed before the resistance of the people, and it merely widened the gulf between the two Churches, and between the Greek Orient and the Latin Occident in general.

In Candia the natives held out for some years against Venetian rule. The confiscated estates were divided into three parts, one being assigned to the Latin Church, and one to the State, while the third was broken up into some hundreds of petty fiefs. A duke was appointed as the head of the government, with councillors, chamberlains, advocates, a captain-general of infantry, and a proveditor in command of the horse-soldiers.

These numerous establishments in the East led to an increase of Venetian trade in the Black Sea, Russia, and Armenia. An important Venetian colony was established in Trebizond. From Constantinople the Venetians maintained commercial relations with the interior of the Balkan peninsula—with the Bulgars, Vlachs, Serbs and Hungarians. At the beginning of the 13th century Venice also increased her trade with the Musulmans of Asia and Africa. In 1219 she concluded a commercial treaty with the Sultan of Iconium, and in 1229 with the Sultan of Aleppo. In Egypt, moreover, she obtained the privileges of security for persons and property, limitation of customs, and special tribunals, though these were not comparable with the privileges obtained in Constantinople and Christian Syria. She concluded a treaty with Tunis in 1251, and she had important establishments, with separate Venetian settlements, in the Tunisian cities.

In the Western Mediterranean Genoa and Pisa were still rivals. Genoa, the mistress of Corsica—but her rule was a sort of suzerainty over a number of Corsican signori rather than an actual government—was contending with Pisa for the possession of Sardinia. The island was divided into *giudicati* or judicatures, the “judges” being vassals of Pisa; but in actual fact they were often independent, or were even allies of Genoa. Mainly on account of Sardinia, which Barbarossa had enfeoffed to Pisa, there was war between the two cities from 1165 to 1175. The peace established by the Emperor in Pavia divided the island between the two claimants. The war was resumed in 1187, when Genoa was defeated in Sardinia. A new peace was concluded in 1188.

In the Western Mediterranean Genoa extended her activities to the African coast in the south and to the coast of Spain in the west, allying herself with the Christian kings of Spain against the Musulmans. From these rulers she obtained concessions analogous to though less numerous than those which the maritime cities of Italy had obtained in the east. Thus, in the first half of the 12th century she acquired Almeria, which was given in fief to a patrician family of Genoa, and a third part of Tortosa, which she sold to the Count of Barcelona. At a later period the Catalan marine rivalled that of Genoa in the Western Mediterranean.

§ 51. **FREDERICK II.**—Frederick II, born in December 1199, was 18 years of age when he was crowned for the first time King of Germany. Of quick intelligence and open mind, and carefully educated, he had a broader and more liberal conception of the world and of life than the majority of his contemporaries. He was interested in observations of natural phenomena and scientific experiments, and he was tolerant and benevolent in his attitude to the world of Islam. He was inclined to be sceptical, and his scepticism was not wholly divorced from unbelief. He displayed a greater freedom of manners and customs than the Middle Ages—at least in theory—were able to tolerate. With these nonconformist tendencies he combined an absolutist conception of politics in conflict with the rights of the feudatories, the liberties of the communes, and the privileges of the Church—and with the self-assumed authority of the Church as the supreme directress of Christian society.

Born and reared in Italy, Frederick remained in Italy for the greater part of his life, regarding the kingdom of Sicily as the basis of his political activities, though these were always directed toward dominion over Italy and the Empire. He paid little attention to German affairs, allowing the power of the German magnates to increase to the detriment of the royal power, even favouring, by definite concessions, the formation in Germany of territorial sovereignties, evolving out of the feudal subdivision. In Sicily, on the contrary, he endeavoured to realize his political ideal, which in many respects approached that of the modern State. His work of organization was done mainly in

the years preceding his first conflict with the pontiff, and was given systematic form in the "Constitutions of Melfi," promulgated in 1231—a collection of a few Norman laws and a great many of Frederick's own introduction. These "Constitutions" gave the kingdom an absolutist and bureaucratic character, for all public authority was made dependent upon the king and was exercised by him and his officials. The development of the communes suffered a check and a set-back. Even the Church was subjected to the royal jurisdiction and the royal fiscal system. Its powers of jurisdiction over laymen were almost completely abolished, and the Sicilian clergy could appeal to Rome only in respect of religious causes, nor could they obtain any title to land. The administration of the kingdom was complex, and its organization was hierarchical. At its head was a supreme court of justice (*Magna curia*), and a court of accounts (*Magna curia rationum*). Under the chief officer of the first (*gran giudice*) were the provincial *giustizieri*—criminal judges and chiefs of police; under the chief officer of the second (*gran camerario*) were the *camerari* for financial and civil affairs; and under both were the *bàuli*, whose functions were of a mixed character. The army and the navy were also expanded, and a central military organization was established. A vigorous impulse was given to culture. As the city of Bologna had supported the Guelf party, Frederick decreed that the University of Bologna should be removed to Naples (1224); it was not removed, but the University of Naples was constituted. He did much to improve the famous school of medicine at Salerno. Lastly, Frederick's court was a centre of literary activity. Here the new poetry in the vulgar tongue was written; indeed Frederick himself and his sons were poets.

Frederick had promised the Pope that he would separate the two crowns of Sicily and Germany, and that he would lead a crusade. But he invalidated the first promise by having his son Henry crowned King of the Romans (1220), and he postponed the crusade because he found more important and more urgent things to be done in Italy. However, he did not quarrel with Innocent's successor, Honorius III (1216–1227)—Cencio Savelli, who had been his tutor—owing in some degree to the pacific character of the new Pope. Honorius crowned him Emperor in 1220, allowing him to retain Sicily, and exacting a repetition

of his promise to lead a crusade. However, Frederick's persistent delay led the Pope to adopt a more energetic attitude, so that in 1225 Frederick pledged himself to set out within two years, under penalty of excommunication. The kingdom of Sicily was not yet wholly pacified: the Genoese whom Frederick had expelled from Syracuse (1222) incited the Saracens of the island to rebellion. Many of the latter were transplanted by Frederick to Apulia (Lucera), but the rebellion continued for several years. Some of the feudal magnates, also, were still offering resistance; notably Count Tommaso di Celano in the Abruzzi. Moreover, Frederick was far more interested in the state of affairs in Upper and Central Italy than in the crusade. In Romagna, notwithstanding the surrenders made to the Papacy, Frederick II exercised his own jurisdiction, appointing a count as governor, and seeking to impose his authority in civic disputes. The pontiffs, on the other hand, made various attempts in Emilia and Lombardy to recover "Matildine" estates from the *signori* or the cities. These attempts were followed, in the Veronese March, by conflicts between the supporters of Ezzelin and those of San Bonifacio, in which the communal parties of Vicenza and Verona were involved. In Piedmont Asti, at war with Alessandria, received help from Genoa (1225); while Savona and Albenga, deserting Genoa, submitted themselves directly to the Emperor and his vicar Thomas of Savoy. Florence was endeavouring to subdue the nobles of Casentino—such as the Counts Alberti and the Counts Guidi—and making war on Pisa, defeated the latter in 1222. Their dread of Frederick II induced the Lombard communes (1226) to renew the league to preserve—according to their habitual formula—the Peace of Constance. Frederick replied by depriving them of the privileges conferred by this Peace and putting them to the ban of the Empire; but Honorius III, as arbitrator, re-established the Peace on the basis of the *statu quo* (1227).

In this same year Honorius died and was succeeded by Gregory IX (1227–1241), a Conti, like Innocent III, and like him, an imperialist. Confronted by the threats and exhortations of the Pope, Frederick II set sail from Brindisi, but he turned back almost immediately, as an epidemic was already spreading through the ranks of the army. On hearing of his return Gregory IX (29 September) excommunicated

him, adducing, with other reasons for this step, Frederick's ecclesiastical government in Sicily. Frederick, defending himself, sent a circular to all the princes, and set off again. On landing in Palestine he resorted to diplomacy instead of to arms, obtaining from the Sultan of Egypt a ten years' armistice, with the restitution of Jerusalem to the Christians; and in Jerusalem he assumed the royal crown. In Italy meanwhile Gregory IX had absolved the subjects of the Empire and the kingdom of Sicily from their oath of fealty, and Papal troops had invaded Neapolitan territory. On Frederick's return the Papal forces fled in alarm, and the pontiff—insufficiently supported by the Lombard communes, while the German princes remained loyal to the Emperor—concluded peace at San Germano (1230) on the basis of the *statu quo*, assailing the Emperor from his excommunication. During this war there were battles between the cities of the two parties, especially in Emilia, where Bologna was defeated (1229) by Modena, in alliance with Parma and Cremona. On the conclusion of peace between Pope and Emperor this quarrel was composed; while arbitration settled the dispute between Alessandria, supported by the Lombard League, and Genoa, allied with the Marquis of Monferrato. In the Veronese or Trevisan March Ezzelin III, succeeding his father, who had retired into a monastery, placing himself at the head of the Ghibelline faction, and allying himself with Treviso, made war upon Padua, supported by Azzo d'Este and the Patriarch of Aquileia.

Frederick II, no longer threatened by the Papacy, began more than ever to assert his authority in the kingdom of Italy, convoking a Diet of the Empire in Ravenna. The communes of the League closed the Alpine passes and did not attend the Diet. However, the Diet was held, though poorly attended (1231–1232), and the communes were placed under the ban. Now Ezzelin III entered into a close alliance with the Emperor, seizing Verona in Frederick's name (1232). This was followed by a general war between Guelfs and Ghibellines in the Trevisan March. The sermons of a popular Dominican preacher, Giovanni de Schio, led to the swearing of peace in a vast assembly at Paquara, near Verona (August 1233), attended by representatives of the communes, barons, prelates, and a huge gathering of the people. But this peace lasted for less than two months. Fra Giovanni, however,

took advantage of the situation in order to encourage the persecution of heretics—he was responsible for the burning alive of sixty persons in Verona—and to make himself lord of Vicenza, whence, however, he was soon expelled by Ezzelin and the Paduans.

In the conflict between the communes of the League and the Emperor the Pope once more intervened, and an award of Gregory's decreed the return to the *statu quo* (1233). But the communes continued hostilities, supporting the son of the Emperor, Henry, in his rebellion against his father. However, the Pope supported the Emperor, who in return gave the pontiff his assistance against the Roman commune, and Henry was compelled to surrender (1235). The rebellion having been suppressed, Frederick returned to Italy (1236), vigorously resuming hostilities against the League. Ezzelin took Vicenza, in November 1236, and a little later Padua, thereby acquiring a position of great power. In the cities thus occupied the nobles continued to conspire and offer resistance; but Ezzelin repressed such insurgence by terroristic methods of an unheard-of character. This was the birth of personal rule and dictatorship. The German forces, in conjunction with those of the Italian Ghibellines, inflicted a heavy defeat upon the army of the League at Cortenuova, near Bergamo, on the 28 November 1237. The *carroccio* fell into the hands of the Emperor, who sent it to Rome, so that it might be preserved in Campidoglio as a trophy of his victory, and as a sign to the Pope and to all sovereigns that God, a just judge, had decreed in favour of the rights of the Empire. Many of the communes submitted, and in a solemn assembly held in Verona in the following year the Emperor received the homage of a number of cities, among which were Florence and Genoa. But this triumph was more apparent than real: Milan and other communes were still in the field, and shortly after his victory Frederick was vainly besieging Brescia. At this juncture the conflict with the Papacy was resumed, and there was no further question of settlement.

Gregory IX, confronted with Frederick's victories, assumed the part of protector of the communes, while the Emperor rejected the Papal intervention and expressed his intention of making Rome the effective capital of the Empire. When Frederick then gave the title



of King of Sardinia to his natural son Enzo, who had married Adelasia, the ruler of a portion of the island, the pontiff, who regarded Sardinia and Corsica as subject to his suzerainty (§ 44), seized this pretext for a fresh rupture with the Emperor. On Palm Sunday 1239 Gregory IX for the second time excommunicated Frederick, absolving his subjects from their oath of fealty, and laying the Papal interdict on every place in which he sojourned. The propaganda of revolt against the emperor was conducted with special zeal by the members of the new mendicant Orders. The Papal and imperial chancelleries issued fiery manifestos, appealing to public opinion, which on the whole was inclined to favour Frederick rather than the Pope.

Frederick now made an attempt to end the conflict by a direct resort to arms, and crossing Tuscany—where the Guelf cities of Florence and Perugia were opposed to the Ghibelline cities of Siena and Arezzo—he marched upon Rome (February 1240). But the pontiff succeeded in turning the people against him, and he withdrew. In the meantime the war was raging in Upper Italy with varying results: Ezzelin was ravaging the Trevisan March; in Ferrara, captured by the Guelfs, under the leadership of the Papal legate, Azzo d'Este replaced Salinguerra; and the Venetians, who had various grievances against Frederick, attacked Apulia. The Pope then convoked a general Council, in order to settle the dispute, but Frederick forbade those prelates who were his subjects to attend it, and a Siculo-Pisan fleet defeated the Genoese fleet which was escorting the prelates to Rome (May 1241), so that they fell into the Emperor's hands. Gregory IX died in August 1241. After the pontificate of Celestine IV, which lasted only a fortnight, the Holy See was vacant for eighteen months. Finally Innocent IV was elected (1243-1254), a member of the Genoese house of Fieschi, which was Ghibelline. Frederick initiated negotiations for peace, making large concessions; but no agreement was reached, because the Pope wished at the same time to settle the conflict between the Emperor and the Lombard cities. In the Oecumenical Council of Lyons Innocent IV (17 July 1245) pronounced final sentence against Frederick, by which the Emperor—guilty of perjury and sacrilege, suspect of heresy, and the violator of the peace established between Church and Empire, and of his feudal obligations

as King of Sicily—was deprived of all his dignities, while all his subjects were forbidden to obey him, and the German electors were invited to choose a new king. As regarded the crown of Sicily, the pontiff reserved his decision.

Frederick declared the sentence to be an abuse of power on the part of the pontiff; but Innocent IV maintained it in a letter to the princes, in which he unfolded the Papal theory of the subordination of the temporal to the spiritual power. The mendicant Orders, by the Pope's instructions, preached the crusade against Frederick instead of against the Musulmans. In Germany two anti-kings were created in succession; but these "priests' kings" were unable to assert themselves, as their supporters were confined almost entirely to the clergy. In Italy, on the other hand, the Guelf party was powerful, notwithstanding Ezzelin, and won an important victory over the Emperor, defeating the Ghibellines at Parma. The Emperor laid siege to the city, bestowing the name of "Vittoria" on his encampment of huts, as though it had been the beginning of the new city which would take the place of Parma when the latter had been destroyed. But during the Emperor's absence the Parmesans made a sortie, defeating the besieging army and destroying Vittoria (1248). In the following year the Bolognese defeated King Enzo at Fossalta, taking him prisoner. He never regained his freedom. Frederick found himself surrounded by real or suspected traitors. His chancellor, Pier delle Vigne, imprisoned by the Emperor, committed suicide (1249). Frederick was still in a position to continue the struggle with great possibilities of success when he died in the fortress of Fiorentino, in Capitanata.

§ 52. THE LAST OF THE SWABIANS AND THE COMING OF THE ANGEVINS.—Frederick II had ordained in his testament that the union of the two kingdoms of Germany and Sicily should continue in perpetuity. And in Sicily the regency was assumed by Manfred, Prince of Taranto, the natural son of the Emperor, on behalf of his legitimate son Conrad, who in 1237 had already been proclaimed king of the Romans. When Innocent IV returned to Italy, strong in the support of the Guelf party, he declared himself the supreme ruler of the kingdom of Sicily, and sent thither a cardinal with plenary powers,

proclaiming that the laws of Frederick were abrogated, and exhorting the nobles and people to rebel. Manfred, however, resisted, until in 1252 Conrad entered the kingdom, where he was making satisfactory progress when he died, in his twenty-seventh year, at Lavello in Basilicata (1254). Manfred was unjustly suspected of having poisoned him. With Conrad's death one may say that the tie between the kingdom of Sicily and the kingdom of Germany was broken in law and in fact, for Conrad's son Corradino, then a child, was never proclaimed King of Germany.

In Southern Italy the Pope and Manfred were left confronting each other. Manfred, intelligent and energetic, and completely Italian, assumed the regency on behalf of Corradino, and proceeded with the suppression of the Papal party within the kingdom. The incapacity of the new pontiff, Alexander IV (1254-1261), by whom he was excommunicated, contributed to his success. On receiving news of Corradino's death, of which he was accused of contriving, Manfred assumed the crown (1258), when military necessity compelled him to extend his influence on the mainland, where he had the support of the Ghibelline party. Genoa concluded a commercial treaty with him; the commune of Rome, governed by the energetic senator Brancaleone, a member of a Bolognese family, became his ally; and in Tuscany the Ghibellines won a great victory over the Guelfs at Montaperti, which made them the masters of Florence (1260), where the representative of Manfred became the virtual ruler of the city. In Northern Italy Ezzelin da Romano, crueller and more bitterly hated than ever, at last provoked the opposition of a league of Guelfs and Ghibellines, by which he was defeated at Cassano on the Adda, dying of wounds received in the battle (1259). But his death did not mean the fall of the Ghibelline party: this was now led by Oberto Pelavicini, lord of Cremona, and Buoso di Dovare (both of whom had taken part in the league against Ezzelin), and above them was Manfred himself, who appointed vicars for Lombardy, Tuscany, Spoleto and the Marches, hinting at the formation of a kingdom of Italy which would have no connection with Germany and the Empire. His dominion now extended to the East—to the territories which had come to him as the dowry of the daughter of the tyrant of Epirus (one of

the Greek states formed after Constantinople had fallen into the hands of the Latins); and his power was further increased by the marriage of his daughter Constance to Pedro of Aragon.

The possibility of finding in one of the European courts a Papal candidate for the throne of Sicily had already been considered by Innocent IV; and after various unfruitful attempts he had entered into relations with Charles of Anjou, brother of the King of France, Louis IX (St. Louis). Now Pope Urban IV (1261-1264), a Frenchman, again offered the crown to Charles, who by his marriage with Beatrice, the heiress of the Count of Provence (which was nominally a province of the Empire), had become the ruler of Provence, and had subsequently conquered Nice and a number of Piedmontese communes, so that he was naturally tempted to extend his power in Italy. The agreement between himself and the Papacy was definitely concluded with Urban's successor, Clement IV (1265-1268), another Frenchman. Charles promised that he would administer the kingdom as a fief of the Church, would revoke such Constitutions as were contrary to the liberty (that is, to the privileges) of the Church, would concede to his subjects the immunities and privileges of William the Good, and would not make himself ruler of Tuscany, or Lombardy, nor King of Germany, nor Emperor. Charles repaired to Rome, where he was made senator of the city by the triumphant Guelf party, and here he was joined by the army, which had marched from Piedmont into Lombardy, where it was reinforced by the Torriani (§ 53), the Estensi, and other Guelfs. The feebleness of the resistance offered by the Ghibelline leaders was attributed to treachery. On the 6th January 1266 Charles of Anjou was crowned King of Sicily in St. Peter's, after which he immediately moved off towards the south. On the 26 February he encountered King Manfred at Benevento. Manfred, after a vigorous but unsuccessful resistance on the part of his Saracen and German troops—the Italians had deserted him—was defeated and slain, battling with desperate valour.

There was still one Swabian rival left: the young Corradino. Responding to the appeal of the Ghibellines, and counting on the discontent which very quickly manifested itself in the new Angevin kingdom, he entered Italy (1267). His army having been reinforced by

Ghibelline troops, he marched upon Rome, where the people, having revolted against Charles and expelled the Pope, gave him a joyous welcome (July 1268). But near Tagliacozzo in the Abruzzi Corradino's army, which after an initial victory had dispersed in search of booty, was defeated by Charles's reserves (23 August). Corradino, who had fled to Rome, on finding that the Guelfs were again in power, took refuge at Astura, between Anzio and Terracina, with the Ghibelline Giovanni Frangipane, who surrendered him to Charles. He was taken to Naples, where the Angevin had him sentenced to death as guilty of *lèse majesté*, and he was decapitated in one of the city squares, on the 29 October.

During the final period of the Swabian dynasty there had been great changes in the East affecting the Mediterranean status of Italy, and, more particularly, that of the two maritime republics of Genoa and Venice. The Latin Empire of Constantinople, inadequately supported by Venice, fell, and the Greek Empire was restored by Michael Palaeologus, Emperor in Nicaea—another of the Greek states which had been established since 1204—with the assistance of the Genoese (1261). He inaugurated the dynasty of the Palaeologi, who continued to reign until Constantinople fell into the hands of the Turks. He did not, however, succeed in reconquering the whole of the territory of the Empire; in the Morea or Peloponnesus various French princes maintained their sovereignty, while Venice still held Negroponte, the Cyclades, and Candia. The Venetians, however, now at war with the Greek Empire, were no longer in the advantageous position which they had so long enjoyed. This was now occupied by the Genoese, who held the suburbs of Galata and Pera, overlooking the Bosphorus. However, after a time the Venetians succeeded in making peace with Palaeologus, when they recovered their old "quarter" in Constantinople and some of their ancient privileges; but they were still confronted with the rivalry of the Genoese, who now made their way into the Black Sea, founding the colonies of Caffa and Balaclava in the Crimea. Moreover, they concluded commercial treaties with the King of Cyprus, with Egypt, and with the African states, obtaining concessions (*quartieri*) and establishing magazines. A naval war broke out between the two republics, and a series of great naval battles was

fought, in which the Venetians were usually victorious. (Durazzo 1264, Trapani 1267, St. John of Acre 1267.) In 1270, at Cremona, through the mediation of Louis IX, King of France, a five years' truce was concluded between the two republics and Pisa, then an ally of Venice, though this did not compose the fundamental differences between the contending states.

## CHAPTER IX

### *THE PAPACY, THE ANGEVINS, AND THE SIGNORIE*

§ 53. THE BEGINNING OF THE SIGNORIE.—After the fall of Corradino the political ties between Italy and the Empire were not at once re-established. There ensued the so-called period of the “great interregnum,” when various rival candidates were elected in Germany, none of whom was able to exercise effective authority in that country. This was the end of the union, or the possibility of the union, in the hands of a single monarch, of the Empire, the kingdom of Italy, and the kingdom of Sicily; nor was any alliance possible between the northern and southern monarchies, for with the change of dynasty the Empire and the kingdom of Sicily had necessarily become antagonistic. There was therefore a return to the situation which had existed before the reign of Henry IV, except that the Empire was far less powerful. Nor could the political influence and territorial possessions of the Angevin dynasty overseas be compared with those which the kingdom of Germany and the Empire had given to the Swabian dynasty. Italy, therefore, had taken yet another great step on the path to autonomistic particularism, yet the new Sicilian dynasty could still place itself at the head of one of the contending factions in Italy—leading the Guelfs as Manfred had led the Ghibellines—and in this way endeavour to achieve hegemony. And here another factor came into operation: the Guelf party, hitherto under the direct orders of the pontiff himself, or of his legates, had now another leader, whose political influence was more immediate: namely, the lay sovereign of an Italian State. This gave rise to a dualism within the party, and the Papacy had to guard against the danger of a united Italo-Guelf party under another command than its own, just as it had hitherto been obliged to guard against a united Ghibelline party. The Guelf party, moreover, being now led by an individual Italian

potentate, had lost its definitely national character, and was no longer united in its resistance to a foreign power (the Germanic Empire), while its individual character—that of an internal faction opposing another faction—was accentuated. By this very fact the support which it rendered to the pontiff, when it did support him—for sometimes, as we shall see, he endeavoured to rise above the two factions—was forever involving the Papacy in the political conflicts of the Italians.

The continuance of the external and internal conflicts of the various city-states of Italy gave the new King of Sicily and the pontiff ample opportunity for intervention. These conflicts favoured both the subjection of a number of communes to one larger commune, a process which had been going on for some time, and the concentration of power within the commune in the hands of a single individual. Thus arose the *signorie* (lordships), which represented, within certain limits, a revival of the feudal nobility from which many of the *signori* derived: a revival not in the sense of a restoration of the feudal orders, but in the sense that certain families of feudatories became the lords of the commune.

In Lombardy Milan was more predominant than ever. Its dominion extended from Bergamo to Vercelli, from Como to Lodi. Just as Milan had been among the earliest communes of Italy—if it was not actually the first—so it was now among the earliest *signorie*. In the latter years of Frederick II's reign Pagano della Torre, the possessor of wide feudal domains in Lombardy, acquired great power in the city. The popular party—composed of two associations, the *Motta* of the wealthy burgesses and the *Credenza di Sant Ambrogio*, which was the organization of the artisans—made him their leader against the nobility of Milan (with whom were associated the nobility of the counties of Seprio and Martesana), appointing him "Captain of the People." His nephew Martin, coming after him, bore the title of "Ancient of the People," whose office was to repress acts of violence on the part of the nobles, which were not sufficiently punished by the tribunals. After the death of Frederick II the internal conflicts were aggravated, perhaps by the diminution of external pressure, and by 1253–1256 the attempt had been made to remedy this state



of affairs by the brief *signoria* of the Marquis Manfredo Lancia, a kinsman and follower of Manfred. There was then a split in the popular party, between the Credenza and the Motta, for the Credenza chose Martino della Torre as their captain, but the Motta refused to accept him, and made common cause with the nobility. The struggle between the nobles and the people became intervolved with the war between Ezzelin (supported by the nobles) and his opponents. When Ezzelin was defeated Martino della Torre nominated, as captain-general for a term of five years, Oberto Pelavicini (1259), one of the leaders of the coalition against Ezzelin, though he retained for himself the leadership of the people, in which his brother Filippo succeeded him (1263). Filippo, on the conclusion of Pelavicini's term of office, conferred the *signoria*, again for five years, on Charles of Anjou, who was represented by a Provençal *podestà*, attended by French men-at-arms. In 1265 Filippo was succeeded as head of the popular faction by a kinsman of his, Napoleone, who bore the title of "Perpetual Ancient."

While the followers of della Torre led the Guelf party in Lombardy, we find that in the Trevisan March the Ezzelini had been succeeded by the Ghibelline Scaligers. Mastino della Scala, a member of a family which had suffered greatly under Ezzelin, was appointed, after the fall of the latter, "Podestà of the People" in Verona (1259), where the people, acting through the organization of the *Arti*, were then in power. The strongest of the *Arti*, that of the Merchants, made him its *podestà* in 1261; in 1262 he was probably Captain of the People. The foreign *podestà* and the other communal organs had not been abolished, but in actual fact they were subject to the ruling popular faction. Threatened by the Guelfs outside the city, the popular-signorial commune of Verona went over to the Ghibellines and championed the cause of Corradino.

In Genoa too at this period the commune evolved into the popular and signorial stage. In 1257 Guglielmo Boccanegra was created Captain of the People by the *popolari* and the Ghibelline nobles. He was overthrown in 1262 by the nobles who had supported him, and by a section of the wealthy middle class, and the Guelf faction was triumphant. But in 1270 the Guelfs fell, and two Captains of the People

were created—noble and Ghibelline—to whom was added, about a year later, a popular magistrate, the “Abbot of the People.”

In the largest commune of Central Italy, Florence, the people were gaining in influence by means of their own organization, until at last they assumed a preponderant position in the government of the city, but without introducing the signorial regime. On the death of Frederick II the Guelfs gained the upper hand over the Ghibellines in Florence, and drove them out of the city, with the approval of the wealthy merchants, or *popolo grasso*, as well as with that of the *popolo minuto*, since they were exasperated by the arrogance of the *grandi*, most of whom were Ghibellines. A new democratic organization was now introduced: that of the *primo popolo* (1250). It was based upon the military organization of the citizens in twenty *gonfalon*i, at the head of which was the Captain of the People (not a Florentine), who bore the *gonfalone* or standard of the commune, and represented the people as opposed to the magnates, and sometimes to the *podestà*. The towers of the nobles were cut down to a height of 96 feet. In addition to this military organization there were twelve “ancients,” who represented the popular interests in the government of the city and proposed laws in the councils: and care was taken to ensure that the magnates should be in the minority on these councils.

The battle of Montaperti (§ 52), which brought back the Ghibellines to Florence, resulted also in the abrogation of the *primo popolo*; but the organization of the *arti* remained. After Benevento the Ghibellines abandoned the city, and the people strove in vain to recover their power; Charles of Anjou, who had sent troops into the city, was appointed *podestà* for six years, the commander of these troops acting as his vicar. In addition to the commune (*podestà* and councils, with twelve “good men” in place of the ancients) there was constituted, as a controlling power, in the place of the popular organization, the organization of the Guelf party, the principal officer of which was the “Captain of the People of the Guelf party,” who supervised the confiscation of the property of condemned Ghibellines for the benefit of the party. Under instructions from Charles of Anjou Florence formed a Guelf League, which Prato, Pistoia, Lucca and Volterra were compelled to join.

§ 54. THE IMPERIALISTIC POLICY OF CHARLES OF ANJOU.—We see that Charles of Anjou had many cards in his hand when he resumed the policy of hegemony which had already been pursued by Manfred. He was created Vicar Imperial (1268) by the Pope, who once more arrogated to himself the exercise of the imperial functions in Italy, the imperial throne being vacant. In Upper Italy the Guelf party had the upper hand, since the Ghibelline leaders, Buoso di Dovara and Pelavicini, having been defeated, had lost all power, and in 1269 Pelavicini died. In the same year Charles called a meeting of the Lombard communes at Cremona, where a Guelf League was formed, in which Napoleone della Torre held the predominant position. In Piedmont and Liguria Charles had installed his *signoria* in various communes which were desirous of his protection against the republic of Genoa and Monferrato. Guglielmo VII (1253–1292), the “Great Marquis” of Monferrato, also entered into a league (1264) with Charles of Anjou, in order to increase his power by leading the Guelf party. He did in fact obtain the *signorie* of Cuneo, Savigliano, Cherasco, Ivrea, and Turin (wrested from Savoy). Moreover, together with the Este he joined the Guelf League of Cremona.

Marquis Guglielmo and Napoleone della Torre had therefore become the two most influential personages in Lombardy, and for this very reason they were hostile to the hegemonical ambitions of Charles of Anjou. Guglielmo VII sought *rapprochement* with the Empire, marrying the daughter of one of the elected “Kings of the Romans,” Alfonso of Castile, from whom he obtained the imperial vicariate in Lombardy (1271). Charles, however, was able to undermine these potentates, entering into an agreement with the smaller cities of Lombardy (Parma, Piacenza, Cremona, Brescia), which now went over to him as the cities of Piedmont had already done. But in order to consolidate his own hegemony in Italy he would have had to concentrate all his activities in the peninsula, the more so as the kingdom of Sicily could not furnish him with sufficient financial and military resources for a great international policy.

This elementary truth escaped him. Reviving and even enlarging the plans of the Norman and Swabian dynasties, he turned to the conquest of the East, where the real interests of Sicily called for a

commercial expansion merely. He promised his support to the de-throned Latin Emperor of Constantinople, Baldwin II, to whose son Philip de Courtenay he gave his own daughter Beatrice in marriage. He obtained the homage of the Franco-Greek principality of Achaia by the marriage of the heiress, Isabelle de Villehardouin, to his son Philip. He also took advantage of the crusading zeal of his brother Louis IX, inducing him to take up arms against Tunisia (1270) in the "Eighth Crusade." Louis died of the plague in the course of this expedition, but Charles, intervening with the Genoese and the Sicilians, persuaded the Sultan of Tunisia to declare himself his tributary, as in the time of the Normans and the Hohenstaufen, and without more ado he abandoned the crusade. He then formed a twofold relationship with the Hungarian royal family of Arpad.

In pursuit of his policy of hegemony in Italy and abroad Charles had need of a friendly Pope and a continuing interregnum in the Empire. Gregory X, however (1271-1276), whether in order to facilitate the plan of a continual crusade, or hoping to undermine the threatening power of the Angevin, took pains to give Germany another sovereign. Rudolf of Habsburg (1273-1291), the new choice of the German sovereigns, a member of a family which had then but little power, was acknowledged by all, not only in Germany, but also by the principal *signori* of Lombardy. He created Napoleone della Torre imperial vicar in Milan (1274).

Gregory X put a further obstacle in the way of the Angevin's Eastern policy by proposing, in the 2nd Council of Lyons (the 14th Oecumenical Council), the union of the Greek with the Roman Church (1274), a union which was concluded by the Emperor Michael Palaeologus, and which was actually realized for a time. In the same Council Rudolf of Habsburg showed himself in complete agreement with the pontiff, promising him that all his rights should be respected, and was proclaimed the leader of the newly organized crusade.

In Upper and Central Italy Gregory X took great pains to conclude pacts (which were not in fact very lasting) between the Guelfs and Ghibellines, so that here too he was working against Charles as head of the Guelf party. He also stipulated for the return of the

Ghibelline exiles to Florence, but this Charles was able to prevent. A league was formed between the Marquis of Monferrato, Asti, Genoa and Pavia—Genoa had for many years been hostile to Charles—which brought about the overthrow of the Angevin dominion in Piedmont. In Lombardy Ottone Visconti was created Archbishop of Milan by Gregory X. When the Torriani refused to accept him he placed himself at the head of the Milanese exiles, defeated Napoleone della Torre at Desè, and entered Milan, where he was proclaimed *signore* for life by the people (1277). The Visconti now became the leaders of the Ghibelline party in Lombardy; but for some time they had to suffer the preponderance of the Marquis of Monferrato, to whom Visconti himself had given the *signoria* of Milan, in order to obtain his services as leader in the war against the Torriani. It was at this time that the “great Marquis” attained the apogee of his power, which extended from Cuneo and Turin to Novara, Como and Crema.

Charles persisted in his plans of Oriental conquest. Having acquired the rights of a descendant of the kings of Jerusalem, in 1277 he sent an expedition to Syria, which succeeded in occupying Acre and obtaining for Charles the homage of most of the Latin barons. The new pontiff, however, Nicholas III (1277–1280), was even more hostile to Charles than Gregory X had been. He compelled him to resign the office of vicar in Tuscany and of senator in Rome (which the Pope had conferred upon himself); he continued the policy of pacification among the Italian cities, and in Florence he brought about a peace (1280)—which this time was carried into effect—by the terms of which Cardinal Latino (1280) assigned eight “buoni uomini” to the Guelfs and six to the Ghibellines; and he offered the imperial crown to Rudolf of Habsburg, who, however, was unable to come to receive it. At the same time Nicholas, mindful of the interests of the Papacy, obtained from Rudolf the final cession of the imperial rights over Romagna and the Marches, appointing a count over the heads of the local *signori*, who were compelled to swear fealty to the pontiff. Nicholas III also took measures for the aggrandisement of his own family, and it was rumoured that he intended to set up two monarchies in Tuscany and Lombardy for his nephews.

On the death of Nicholas III Charles intimidated the Conclave, which was held in Viterbo, hoping to compel it to elect a Pope who would favour his policies. In this he was successful; the Conclave elected Martin IV (1281–1285), a Frenchman, who had himself elected senator in Rome, and then appointed Charles as his vicar. His favours were all for the Guelf party, and he excommunicated the Emperor of the East, taking advantage of the revival of religious disputes. But now, just as Charles was enabled to make war upon Byzantium with the help of the Pope and the Venetians, with whom he had concluded an alliance, as with the Serbs, the Bulgars, and the princes of Epirus and Greece, the insurrection of the Vespers broke out.

§ 55. THE WAR OF THE VESPERS AND THE SEPARATION OF NAPLES AND SICILY.—Among the factors contributing to the fall of the Swabians were the absolutist regime of Frederick II and the harshness of his fiscal policy. Pope Clement IV obtained Charles of Anjou's promise that he would grant his subjects, whether feudatories or inhabitants of the demesne cities (that is, those cities which were subject immediately to the crown), the immunities and privileges which they had enjoyed under William II. But Charles, who needed money to pay the debts incurred to meet his campaigning expenses, to provide for the annual tribute to the pontiff, and to defray the cost of his grandiose foreign policy, not only found himself compelled to retain the fiscal system of the Swabians, but actually rendered it more oppressive. To this must be added the spoliation of native feudatories for the benefit of the Frenchmen who had come in his train, in order to establish themselves in the kingdom, and the arrogant and vexatious behaviour of the new *signori*, to say nothing of the appointment to almost all the governmental posts of Frenchmen in the place of local candidates. The discontent was most serious in Sicily, where a few partial risings in favour of Corradino had been savagely suppressed, with the extermination of whole populations and the spoliation of many of the nobles. The Sicilians, moreover, were angered by the licentious manner in which the French behaved to their wives and daughters, who were accustomed to a regime like

that of the Moslem women. And they felt themselves to be affronted by the fact that Charles had removed his court from Palermo to Naples.

The discontent of the islanders was observed and had probably been secretly nourished by Pedro III of Aragon, the son-in-law of Manfred, whose court had become the refuge of many fugitives from the kingdom. Prominent among them were Giovanni da Procida, formerly the most trusted of Manfred's councillors, and Ruggero di Lauria, a nobleman of Basilicata. Pedro III concluded an alliance with the Emperor of the East, and made preparations for a military expedition, apparently against Tunisia.

However, the Sicilian insurrection broke out as the result of a spontaneous popular movement, independently of the schemes of Pedro and his advisers, on the 31 March 1282, during the celebration of the Easter festival in the church of the Holy Ghost near Palermo (this was on Easter Tuesday). It seems that the cause of the revolt was the insulting behaviour of the French soldiers toward the Sicilian women. Amidst cries of "Mora, mora!" all the French in Palermo were massacred, and the people set up a communal government, appealing for the protection of the Church. The revolt spread throughout the island, which in less than a month was rid of the French invaders, the majority of whom were massacred; and the cities, forming themselves into a league, invoked the protection of the Pope as their suzerain. Martin IV refused his protection, and advised the Sicilians to submit themselves to Charles, under penalty of excommunication. Charles laid siege to Messina, but the citizens put up a heroic defence, which was celebrated in popular songs all over Italy. The nobles now placed themselves at the head of the insurrection; and Pedro of Aragon was acclaimed king in a Sicilian *parlamento*. He left Tunis for Sicily, landing at Trapani (30 August), while Charles quitted the island. The Pope excommunicated Pedro and laid his interdict on Sicily, preaching the crusade against it. The "War of the Vespers" between the Angevins and the Aragonese was fought mainly at sea; in the Gulf of Naples the valiant admiral Ruggero di Lauria defeated the Angevin fleet, capturing the crown prince Charles the Lamé, who had made preparations for a great

expedition against Sicily (June 1284). The Angevin party then attempted to make a direct attack upon Aragon, with the support of the King of France, Philip III (the Bold), the nephew of Charles of Anjou. The pontiff deposed Pedro (Aragon having been in a state of vassalage to the Holy See since the time of Innocent III), and the second son of Philip III, Charles of Valois, was proclaimed king in his place. But Philip's invasion of Aragon was unsuccessful (1285). In this same year Charles of Anjou died, and was succeeded by Charles II (1285-1309)—who, however, was not liberated until about a year later—and by Pedro III. This latter bequeathed to his eldest son, Alfonso, his Spanish dominions, and to his second son the crown of Sicily. The war was continued until the death of Alfonso, when Jaime, becoming King of Aragon (1291), entered into negotiations with a view to renouncing the crown of Sicily. In 1295 an agreement was concluded by which Jaime restored Sicily to the Pope, who invested him with the crown of Corsica and Sardinia. The Sicilians refused to accept the agreement, and proclaiming Frederick king—the younger brother of Jaime—they continued a stubborn defence, so that even the landing of a great French expedition under Charles of Valois, the brother of the new king of France, Philip IV (the Fair, 1302), failed to change the outcome of the war. With the peace of Caltabellotta (August 1302) the Angevins abandoned Sicily to Frederick, who took the title of King of Trinacria, while they continued to bear the title of Kings of Sicily. On the death of Frederick the island was to revert to them.

The war had important consequences as regards the internal order of the two regions. In Naples the Angevin kings were compelled by the war in which they were involved to look for support to the feudality, who became so powerful that they even obtained the cession of cities which were directly subject to the king (demesnial or crown cities). As a result the royal authority and the stability of the kingdom were diminished. In Sicily the power of the parliament was finally established: an assembly of Norman origin, composed of clerical nobles and deputies from the royal cities, with the right to deliberate on questions of peace and war, to vote the taxes, and to censure public officials; and this constitution, similar in its fundamental out-



lines to the English, survived, at least in theory, until 1812. The kings, in order to check the power of the nobles, favoured the liberties of the municipalities. Nevertheless, the feudatories acquired a preponderant influence, to the detriment of the royal authority and the communes. Their conflicts with the latter, and their quarrels among themselves, ravaged the island, which gradually fell into a state of profound decadence.

The consequences of the War of the Vespers were as significant for the general history of Italy as for that of the two countries immediately affected. Sicily, hitherto intimately bound up with the life of the peninsula, now became estranged from it, and ended by entering the orbit of a non-Italian power (the kingdom of Aragon). Naples, on the other hand, from first to last, clung more closely to the rest of Italy, but with diminished strength. The influence which the southern kingdom had exercised in the Mediterranean under the Normans was diminishing; and this may be regarded as one of the causes which contributed to the final downfall of Christian rule in Syria (§ 57).

§ 56. **LOMBARDY AND TUSCANY.**—During the War of the Vespers the internal and external disturbances affecting the greater cities of Northern and Central Italy continued. In Milan (December 1282) Archbishop Ottone Visconti overthrew the government (*signoria*) of the Marquis Guglielmo VII of Monferrato (who had already, in 1280, lost Turin, which was taken from him by Thomas III of Savoy), and was once more proclaimed *signore*. There followed in Lombardy a war between the forces of Visconti and Monferrato, the latter being reinforced by the Torriani. The Visconti were able to hold their own; in 1284 Archbishop Ottone concluded a treaty with King Rudolf, and in 1287 his grand-nephew Matteo (I) was proclaimed Captain of the People. In 1288 Milan, Pavia, Asti, Genoa, Cremona, Piacenza and Brescia formed a league against Monferrato. He succeeded with the support of the exiles in making himself lord of Pavia; but in Milan a conspiracy in his favour failed in its purpose, nor was he more successful in an armed attack upon the city. Alessandria rebelled against him and took him prisoner (September 1290), con-

fining him in a cage, in which he remained until his death (February 1292). It looked as though this would be the end of the Monferrine *signoria*; a great deal of its territory was occupied by Asti, and part of the Canavese, which was subject to the marquises, surrendered itself to Philip of Savoy (or Achaia), while in Como, Novara, Vercelli, Alessandria and Pavia, the overlordship of Matteo Visconti supplanted that of Monferrato. Guglielmo's fifteen-year-old son, Giovanni (1292-1305), was obliged at first, in order to preserve at least his hereditary possessions, to accept Matteo as his governor. When he was older he contrived to liberate himself from this tutelage, and he recovered the domains which had been seized by Asti; but his tentative alliances against the Visconti in Piedmont and Lombardy did not procure him any conspicuous advantage. He died without sons, and was succeeded by the Greek dynasty of the Palaeologi in the person of Theodore Palaeologus (1305-1339), son of the marriage of Violante, daughter of the "great Marquis," with the Emperor Andronicus II.

In 1294 the authority of Matteo Visconti received its juridical consecration from the King of Germany, Adolphus of Nassau (who had followed Rudolph of Habsburg), together with the title of vicar imperial. The anti-Viscontean league, which in 1299 Monferrato had formed in Lombardy, and which had been joined by the Marquis Azzo VIII of Este, was now quickly dissolved. Greater success attended a second league, between Monferrato and the Torriani. This was supported by disturbances in Milan, which in 1302 brought about the fall of the Visconti and the return of the Torriani. The Visconti became warlike exiles, and in 1308 Guido della Torre was proclaimed Captain of the People for life (the first instance of the kind in Milan).

In Verona Mastino della Scala was assassinated in 1277. His brother Alberto, who since 1209 had been *podestà* of the merchants, was proclaimed, in his place, "captain and rector of the *gastaldi* (that is, the heads) of the handicrafts and of all the people of Verona," and very extensive executive, legislative and military powers were conferred upon him. He remained in close alliance with the Visconti of Milan, and with Pinamonte de' Bonaccolsi, lord of Mantua, and was

thus able to hold his own against the hostility of Padua, Vicenza, Ferrara and Modena. Later on he made his son Bartolomeo his associate in the captaincy, and was succeeded by him in 1301. On his death in 1304 his place was taken by his brother Alboin, with whom was associated the younger Can Grande. Alboin was created *podestà* for life of the merchants. To the south of Verona and Milan the *signoria* of the Este was undergoing expansion. Obizzo d'Este, already lord of Ferrara (§ 51), was declared its hereditary ruler by the Council General of Modena (January 1289), and a year later this example was followed by Reggio.

The internal life of Genoa was becoming more and more turbulent. In 1289 the Guelfs made an unsuccessful attack upon the two captains of the nobility and the abbot of the people; in 1291 the experiment was made of a non-Genoese captain; but a year or so later the city reverted to its native captains. At the beginning of the 14th century the captains' faction was divided between Doria and Spinola: the latter won the upper hand, and in 1309 Obizzo Spinola was proclaimed captain-general of Genoa.

Before these disturbances occurred Genoa had struck a decisive blow at the rival republic of Pisa. The wars of the preceding centuries for predominance in the Tyrrhenian and dominion in the two great islands ended in victory for the Pisans in Sardinia, where they obtained actual possession of a great part of the territory, while they exercised powers of suzerainty over the four judicatures of Arborea, Cagliari, Gallura, and Logudoro (or Torres). Corsica, on the other hand, which was also divided into various judicatures, was under the suzerainty of Genoa. But now the Pisans began to intervene in Corsican affairs, and the result of their interference was a war between the two republics (1282). At first the Pisans, who had the advantage of an alliance with Venice (though this was of scant efficacy), were victorious in Corsica. But the Genoese fleet, which was larger and more skilfully handled, completely defeated the Pisan fleet near the Mellora reef (facing Leghorn) in August 1284. Ten thousand Pisans were taken prisoner, so that the saying became current: if you want to see Pisa, go to Genoa. The war, however, continued; but in the end Pisa was compelled to resign all claim to Corsica, to surrender

part of Sardinia, and to accept certain restrictions in respect of commercial navigation (1300).

At the same time Pisa had been obliged to carry on the war against Florence and the Guelf League (1282), which comprised Prato, Pistoia and Lucca, and even extended beyond the limits of Tuscany, including Bologna on the one hand and Perugia on the other. In 1285 peace was concluded with the League, the Ghibellines being expelled by Count Ugolino della Gherardesca, who was appointed first *podestà* and then captain. But a coalition between the great Pisan families and Archbishop Ruggero degli Ubaldini overthrew and imprisoned Ugolino, when he and his children were left to die of starvation (1288), a tragedy which Dante related in the penultimate canto of the *Inferno*. Pisa then turned Ghibelline once more, in alliance with Arezzo. But at Campaldino (June 1289) Arezzo was defeated by the League, and in 1293 Pisa was compelled to sign the Peace of Fucecchio, by which the Pisans undertook to allow the merchandise of the communes of the League to pass through their territory untaxed, and to elect no *podestà* or captain who should be hostile to the League.

In Florence the peace of Cardinal Latino (§ 54) was of very brief duration; the Ghibellines were once more driven out, and the organization of the Guelf party, or *Monte della parte guelfa*, played an important part in the life of the city, keeping under observation all persons suspected of Ghibelline sympathies. The fourteen "buoni uomini" were replaced (1282) by six priors (one for each ward), elected by the *arti maggiori*. Their number was afterwards increased to twelve, and they were renewed every second month. The movement against the *grandi*, led by Giano della Bella, resulted in the *Ordinamenti di giustizia* (1293), by which the seven *arti maggiori*, the five *arti mediane* and the nine *arti minori* formed a single union, which was to constitute the basis both of the government and of the military organization of the city. The *arti minori*, however, did not take part in the election of the priors and the *gonfaloniere di giustizia*, so that the *borghesia grassa* was still preponderant. Those who were not inscribed in one of the *arti* were excluded from the government of the city. Against those magnates who should be guilty of shedding

the blood of the *popolari* penalties of exceptional severity and a summary procedure were established, the relatives of the offender being held responsible as accessories. A *gonfaloniere di giustizia*, at the head of a special armed force, was appointed, his function being to watch over the execution of the new ordinances. A few years later a coalition of *grandi* and *popolo minuto* brought about the exile of Giano della Bella (1295); but the *Ordinamenti* were retained.

In Florence there was now a fresh conflict between the faction of the Cerchi, to which some of the nobles and the remnants of the Ghibelline party gave their support, and that of the Donati, who were backed more especially by the mercantile upper middle class and the banking interests. In the neighbouring city of Pistoia there was dissension between the "Cancellieri bianchi" and the "Cancellieri neri," and these parties were amalgamated with the Florentine factions, so that the party of the Cerchi became known as the *Bianchi*, or Whites, while that of the Donati was known as the *Neri*, or Blacks. In the ranks of the Whites was Dante Alighieri.

§ 57. VENICE AND GENOA.—Venice had not supported Pisa in the war with Genoa. Even the final downfall of Christian rule in Syria did not rouse her from her inertia. In 1224 the Khovaresmi Turks, called in by the Sultan of Egypt, had annihilated the Christian army at Gaza and taken Jerusalem. Shortly afterwards the rule of the Ayyubites in Egypt was replaced by that of the leader of the Mameluke mercenaries, Baibars, who made himself the master of Syria (1261) and the principality of Antioch (1268). The last crusade of Louis IX (§ 54) having failed, the Christians of Palestine, being left to their own resources, were finally driven out of Tripoli, and St. John of Acre also; and the fall of the latter city (1291) marked the end of Christian dominion in Syria. Plans of further crusades came to nothing, for the Western nations, having now attained to their full development, were concerned with their own affairs, and could no longer be led away by the religious ideals of Christianity; while feudalism and chivalry, those essential elements of such undertakings, were in a state of extreme decadence. As for the mercantile middle class and the larger maritime cities—Venice and Genoa—which represented that

class in the Mediterranean, they found that it was always possible to trade and to conclude commercial treaties even with Musulman princes.

Genoa, in fact, was passing through a period of great commercial expansion, which led to fresh conflicts with Venice in respect of the Bosphorus and the Black Sea. Genoa having established a kind of monopoly in the Black Sea with the support of the Emperor Andronicus II and the King of Cyprus, Venice endeavoured to break it, entering into negotiations with a Tartar prince of the Crimea, with the object of establishing a colony there, to compete with the Genoese colony of Caffa. In 1293 an accidental encounter between Genoese and Venetian galleys gave rise to a resumption of hostilities. In 1294 the Genoese won a great naval battle at Laiazzo, on the coast of Lesser Armenia; in 1296 the Venetians destroyed Pera and penetrated as far as Caffa; in 1297 the Genoese ravaged the coast of Venetian Dalmatia; and lastly, at Curzola, near Lissa, the Genoese admiral Lamba Doria completely defeated the Venetian admiral Andrea Dandolo, capturing eighty-four Venetian galleys (1298). The Genoese also suffered heavy losses, and in the following year peace was concluded in Milan, through the mediation of Matteo Visconti, neither party having won the upper hand.

If Venice sought to wrest the control of the Mediterranean from Genoa, the republic of San Marco was even more anxious to retain the naval monopoly of the Adriatic. It forbade any armed vessel to enter the Gulf of Venice, and compelled all mercantile vessels to pay customs duties, and to land their cargoes in Venice. A squadron of scouts was always scouring the Adriatic in order to ensure the application of these regulations, which were all the more onerous for the other Italian cities of the coast and hinterland, inasmuch as the merchandise affected consisted for the most part of articles of prime necessity, such as grain and salt. As a result there were frequent wars or skirmishes between the republic and the communes of Padua, Treviso, Ferrara, Ravenna, Cervia and Bologna. In the years 1268–1273 there was war between Venice and Bologna, the latter being supported by the other cities of the Romagna. On concluding peace Venice made a few concessions, and this was followed by agreements

with various Italian cities. Now the Venetian preponderance was contested only by Ancona, with which city hostilities continued until the treaty of 1281 was concluded, which conceded certain abatements of duty to the metropolis of the March.

Her dominion over maritime Istria was especially important to Venice. This dominion had had its beginnings, thanks to her maritime monopoly, about the middle of the 12th century. She asserted her territorial sovereignty over Parenzo in 1267, over Cittanova in 1270, over Capodistria in 1278, and over Pirano in 1283. In Istria she came into conflict with the Patriarchs of Aquileia, who held the marquiseate of Istria, and with the Counts of Gorizia, the lords of the interior. In 1291 a revolt of the coastal cities was suppressed by Venice.

Meanwhile the internal evolution of the republic had continued, reinforcing the power of the aristocracy and reducing that of the Doge. Under the Doge Domenico Contarini (1043-1071) the administration of the demesial revenues was separated from that of the ducal revenues, and the former was entrusted to the *Procuratore di San Marco*, a sort of Ministry of Finances. The number of procurators was finally increased to nine. In the second half of the 12th century the aristocratic government assumed a very definite form by the institution of the Grand Council (1172), consisting of 480 members, renewable every year, whose duty it was to appoint, by an increasingly complicated series of scrutinies, the electors of the Doge. In addition to the Grand Council there was also the lesser Council of the *Pregadi* (so called because the Doge "prayed" them to assist him), which afterwards became the Senate; and the Council of Forty, or *Quarantia*. The Doge was not elected by the people, who simply acknowledged his election by acclamation. On taking office, he had to swear an oath to observe the *Promissione ducale*, a sort of constitutional charter, which determined his powers and subjected even his private conduct to severe restrictions. The content of the charter was continually undergoing amplification, and a special commission was appointed to compile it.

At the close of the 13th century the Venetian oligarchy was definitely constituted by the document known as the *Serrata del Gran Consiglio*. In this document (1297) certain rules were laid down in respect

of the right of participation in the Council. This privilege was at first confined to all those families which since 1172 had been represented on the Council by at least one member, but it was afterwards extended to other families which had been admitted since that date. New admissions, as a matter of fact, were frequently made, but they did not modify the oligarchic character of the institution.

One reaction against this concentration of oligarchical power was the conspiracy of Baiamonte Tiepolo. But the insurrection was suppressed; it ended with the flight of Tiepolo and the execution of other conspirators (1310). It was then that the Council of the Ten was first instituted, a body of examining magistrates, whose appointment was a political measure of emergency; but it afterwards became a permanent body, and wielded very great power in the republic.

§ 58. BONIFACE VIII. THE PAPACY IN AVIGNON.—At the close of the 13th century—the throne of the Empire being then vacant, while the great *signorie* of Upper Italy were in process of formation, and the kingdom of Naples was engaged in and weakened by the War of the Sicilian Vespers—the power which was most obviously attempting to exercise a general hegemony over Italy was the Papacy, represented by Boniface VIII.

After the death of Nicholas IV (1292) the quarrels between the various parties in the College of Cardinals—the Angevin party, the party working for the independence of the Papacy, the party of the Orsini, the part of the Colonna—resulted in an interregnum of more than two years. The Council of Lyons (§ 54), in order to avoid the inconvenience of a prolonged vacancy of the Holy See, had issued regulations in accordance with which the cardinals were to be segregated in a closed place or *conclave*, but these were afterwards abolished. In the end a pious hermit was elected: Pier or Pietro da Morrone, from Monte Morrone in the Abruzzi, who took the name of Celestine V (July 1294). He established his see in Naples, and owing to his inexperience he was completely dominated by Charles II. At last, conceding that he was not cut out for a pontiff, he “made in cowardice the great refusal” (*fece per viltade il gran rifiuto*: Dante, *Inferno*, c. III). His successor (December 1294) was Boniface VIII (1294–1303), a



Roman Caetani; a man of great energy, and a most rigid canonist, inspired by an exalted notion of the rights of the Papacy, his conception of which was in accordance with the theocratic ideas of Innocent III and Innocent IV. And with this he combined a tendency already visible under Nicholas III—a tendency to nepotism; that is, to the aggrandisement of his own family. With this end in view he warred against the powerful family of the Colonna, which was supported by the Ghibellines, by Frederick, King of Sicily, and by the spiritual Franciscans (§ 49), whose sympathies were interpreted by Jacopone da Todi (§ 63), with violent invectives against the pontiff. Boniface deprived Giacomo and Pietro Colonna of the cardinalate; they, for their part, declared that his election was illegitimate, because Celestine's renunciation had been invalid; and they demanded the convocation of a General Council (1297). Boniface excommunicated them, preached the crusade against them, razed their stronghold of Palestrina to the ground, and despoiled them of their possessions (1299).

In Sicily his policy, as we have seen, ended in failure. In Tuscany he intervened against Giano della Bella, whose Guelfism was said to be lukewarm. When the division occurred between Blacks and Whites, he supported the Blacks, whose Guelfism was more accentuated, and commissioned Charles of Valois to make peace (§ 55). Charles, whom the state of Sicily had brought into Italy, entered Florence and procured the banishment of the Whites (1302). Among the banished was Dante. Not by such means did Boniface succeed in asserting his suzerainty over Florence.

In Germany he attempted to assert the right of the pontiff to examine the election of the king, and he refused his recognition to Albert of Habsburg or Austria, the successor to Adolphus of Nassau; but he afterwards consented to accept him when he had taken the oath of fealty (1303). This was a notable success; but it was more than neutralized by the opposition of the new great secular monarch, Philip the Fair of France (1285–1314).

Philip was vigorously pursuing the policy of concentrating the royal power, which had already been followed for some time by the Capetian dynasty, and he obtained much assistance from the

jurists, who were fundamentally hostile to feudal and ecclesiastical power. Philip having taxed the clergy in order to obtain financial assistance in the war against the King of England, Boniface VIII issued the Bull *Clericis laicos* (1296), in which, on pain of excommunication, he forbade laymen to levy taxes upon the clergy, or the clergy to pay such taxes. Philip IV replied by prohibiting the export of money from the kingdom—and therefore the payment of the curial dues to the Holy See—and he also forbade foreigners to remain in the kingdom or to trade in it. Boniface, warned by the Italian bankers (especially by the Florentines) who were injured by Philip's prohibition, and who constituted the financial buttress of the Curia, published a second Bull in which he withdrew the prohibition imposed by the first; so that for the time being harmony with France was restored. Since the Colonna and their supporters had now been vanquished, the Pope, to magnify his triumph, proclaimed the Jubilee (*giubileo*), a general indulgence which was henceforth to be conferred every hundredth year upon whomsoever should repair to Rome and perform certain religious acts. The Papal Jubilee was celebrated in the year 1300, by an immense concourse of people, increasing the prestige of the pontiff and bringing him great sums of money.

But soon afterwards the quarrel with France broke out again, reaching a climax. The king convoked the States General, including the ecclesiastics, who were on his side; Boniface convoked a Council in Rome, which was attended even by some of the French bishops, and published the famous Bull *Unam sanctam* (November 1302), in which it was declared that the pontiff is the possessor of the two swords, the spiritual and the temporal, the first of which is wielded by him and the second for him, and that it is therefore essential to the eternal salvation of every human being that he should be subject to the Roman pontiff. Philip, in an assembly of the notables of the realm, accused Boniface of heresy, trafficking with demons, and immorality, and demanded the convocation of a General Council. Boniface made arrangements for the public excommunication of Philip on the 8 September 1303; but on the 7th Guillaume de Nogaret, Philip's chancellor, who was then in Italy, together with Sciarra Colonna and other Roman nobles, made the Pope a prisoner in Anagni, intending

to take him to France. The people of Anagni rescued him, and he returned to Rome, where he died on the 11 October 1303.

His successor, Benedict XI (1303-1304), a Dominican of very mild character, pursued a policy which differed entirely from that of his predecessor. His object was to establish peace in Italy, and between Italy and France, but he died too soon to realize his programme. The Conclave which followed his death elected, after much delay, the Archbishop of Bordeaux, Bertrand de Got, of Gascony (then subject to England). He took the name of Clement V, and having been crowned in Lyons he did not proceed to Italy, but established his see at Avignon (1309), a city belonging to the Angevins, from whom the Popes eventually acquired it (1348). The Papacy remained in Avignon for nearly seventy years (1309-1376), apart from a temporary return to Rome under Urban V (1367-1370). All the Popes of this period were Frenchmen, and so were most of the cardinals; Papal policy was strongly influenced by the King of France, and the rest of the Catholic world—especially in Italy—spoke of the “Babylonian captivity” of the Papacy. The court of Avignon had a bad reputation among its contemporaries, owing to its pomp and worldliness, to say nothing of the extreme harshness of the fiscal system of the Popes. The ascetic and spiritual forces of the period were rekindled against the Papacy, and the Ghibelline theorists were equally active.

§ 59. THE LAST INTERVENTIONS OF THE EMPIRE.—Although Clement V displayed the greatest affability toward Philip the Fair (as is shown by his declaration that Philip was guiltless of the Anagni outrage, and by the abolition of the Templars), he resisted the king’s attempts to persuade the Curia to support the candidature of his brother Charles of Valois, who sought election to the Empire on the death of Albert of Austria (1308). The electors chose, instead of Charles, a modest German feudatory, Henry of Luxemburg (Henry VII, 1308-1313). Clement entered into negotiations with him and promised him the imperial crown.

Henry VII entered Italy at the end of 1310. Many of the parties had invoked his advent, and no one had longed for his arrival with a greater fervour of hope and idealism than Dante Alighieri. In his

*De monarchia* Dante had expounded the moderate Ghibelline theory, that the Empire was independent of the Church as deriving its authority directly from God, though this independence should be accompanied by respect and devotion to the pontiff. Henry, thanks to the nobility of his character, was willing enough to assume the part of peacemaker and organizer which Dante wished to attribute to him. On his arrival in Italy he procured the readmission to many of the cities of the exiles, whether Guelf or Ghibelline; and he recalled the Visconti to Milan, making peace between them and the Torriani. At the same time, however, in order to assert the supreme and impartial authority of the Empire, he appointed vicars imperial—who were not all well-chosen—in many of the cities, demanding hostages and money. Before long the Torriani were driven out of Milan, and Matteo Visconti was created vicar imperial (1311). In Piedmont Teodoro Palaeologus was invested with the vicariate (§ 56); in Verona it was conferred upon Albain and Can Grande (§ 56). The two factions, Guelfs and Ghibellines, took up arms; Brescia was reduced by the Emperor after a stubborn resistance, and the whole of Lombardy was once more in a ferment. Henry VII left it in that state, and repaired to Genoa and Pisa, which acclaimed him as their sovereign. Florence closed her gates against him, refused to make submission, and amalgamated the adjacent cities of Tuscany in a league. Without regarding the fact that Henry VII had just entered into an agreement with the pontiff, Robert, King of Naples (1309–1343), who had succeeded to his father Charles II, placed himself at the head of the Guelf resistance in Italy. In Rome his troops occupied the Leonine city, and Henry VII, on reaching the metropolis, had to allow himself to be crowned in St. John Lateran instead of in St. Peter's (29 June 1312). The Emperor withdrew to Pisa after several attempts upon Florence, and while in Pisa he put Robert to the ban of the Empire, formed an alliance with Frederick, King of Sicily, and made preparations for an expedition against the kingdom of Naples. At this juncture Clement V, whether he was considering the interests of the Papacy, or giving way before the threats of Philip the Fair, broke with the Emperor, pronouncing excommunication against whomsoever should attack Naples. Henry nevertheless began

to march southwards, but he died suddenly at Buonconvento, near Siena, on the 24 August 1313.

Henry VII's Italian expedition did nothing to strengthen the position of the Empire in Italy; indeed, it showed that without a base in the kingdom of Sicily it could count only on the interested and precarious support of local forces. At the same time, it cannot be said that the expedition was entirely ineffective as regards the general political life of Italy. The ideal of the Empire, exalted by Dante not only in *De monarchia*, but also in the *Commedia*, was revived by Henry's advent, rapidly spreading throughout the country before its final extinction. In the sphere of practical politics the Empire was able to assert its rights by the appointment of Italian *signori* as vicars imperial, a step which contributed to the evolution of the *signoria* and to the juridico-political configuration assumed by this institution (§ 61).

After Henry had left Lombardy, and even after his death, the armed conflict continued between the Visconti, supported by the Ghibelline faction, and the anti-Viscontian faction which had offered the *signoria* of Northern Italy to King Robert of Naples. Clement V, in accordance with the new pontifical claim to the regency of the Empire during the vacancy of the throne, appointed Robert of Anjou vicar imperial for the whole of Italy. In October 1314 there was at last a royal election in Germany; but as a result of party conflicts, and the continued uncertainty of the electoral procedure, there was a double election, the two candidates elected being Frederick of Austria and Louis of Bavaria. The new Pope, John XXII (1316-1339), insisted upon his right to act as regent of the Empire until a final decision was reached, and he declared the appointments to the vicariate made by the late emperor to be null and void.

Among those affected by this declaration was Matteo Visconti, who by reason of his religious opinions was unable to ignore the pontifical decrees. He therefore abandoned the title conferred upon him by Henry VII, but allowed the people to proclaim him *signore generale* of Milan. By successful feats of arms, and through the surrender of the inhabitants, his lordship was extended to Como, Bergamo, Piacenza, Tortona, Alessandria and Pavia. He relied very largely on German mercenaries, and his son Marco was distinguished

among the captains of the day. Another son, John, was elected bishop of Milan by the chapter of the cathedral, but the election was not recognized by the Pope. The Ghibelline Viscontian armies finally turned against Genoa, which had expelled the Ghibellines, and besieged the city; Robert of Anjou came to its defence, and was made ruler of the city, in association with the Pope, for a term of ten years. The war spread into Upper Italy from Piedmont—where Asti served as King Robert's base in his attack upon Alessandria—to the Veneto, or, as it was then called, the Trevisan March. Here the most powerful ruler was Can Grande della Scala, Lord of Verona and Vicenza, and later on of Padua also (1328). In a congress of all the Ghibelline leaders, convoked by Matteo in Soncino, Can Grande was appointed leader of the faction; a means of assuring his loyalty, with which Robert of Anjou had been trying to tamper. The Ghibelline party was reinforced also by the Estensi, who were at odds with the Holy See in respect of Ferrara. In 1309 the Pope had conferred the government of the city on Robert of Anjou, and Venice had tried in vain to take possession of it; but in 1317 it had returned to the Este.

In Tuscany the death of Henry VII was followed by a revival rather than a decline of the Ghibelline party. Its leader was Ugucione della Faggiuola, then lord of Pisa and Lucca. In August 1315 he inflicted a great defeat upon the army of Florence—which had given the *signoria* to King Robert for a period of eight years—and the allied Guelfs of Tuscany, Umbria and Romagna. Shortly afterwards Ugucione lost the *signoria* of Pisa and Lucca (1316); but the new lord of Lucca, Castruccio Castracani degli Interminelli, who afterwards became lord of Pistoia also, was likewise a successful leader of the Ghibelline party in Tuscany. In Florence the faction which was opposed to the *signoria* of King Robert prevailed; the Angevin government fell in December 1321, and was not restored.

The Cardinal Legate Bertrando del Poggetto, a kinsman of the Pope, being sent into Lombardy, threw in his lot with the Guelf party, even going so far as to inform the Milanese that they must acknowledge Robert as their lord. In order to reinforce the Guelf armies in Lombardy he sent for Pagano della Torre, Patriarch of Aquileia; and he published the excommunication and interdict pronounced by the

Pope in Avignon against the Visconti, and against Milan, and all the other cities that gave obedience to them, together with the confiscation of property and the enslavement of persons, and he proclaimed the crusade against the condemned persons and cities, with plenary indulgence to those who took part in it. Among the nobles and the people of Milan there was a certain amount of opposition to Matteo; and he, troubled in his conscience by the ecclesiastical censure, surrendered the government of the city, placing it in the hands of his son Galeazzo, and soon after this he died (June 1322).

Galeazzo Visconti (1322–1328), compelled to leave Milan by the emergence of a hostile faction which proposed to conclude an agreement with the cardinal, was recalled after a very brief interval and acknowledged as *signore*. The legate's army, however, continued the war with varying fortunes. In Tuscany also the war continued, and here the Ghibelline faction was uppermost; Castruccio obtained the *signoria* of Pistoia, and in September 1325, at Altoparscio, he inflicted a great defeat on the Florentines, although they had been reinforced by fifteen cities of Tuscany, Romagna and Umbria, and they were obliged to confer the *signoria* for ten years on Charles, Duke of Calabria, the son of King Robert. Charles sent them as his vicar Walter (Guaetieri, Gautier) of Brienne, Duke of Athens, and obtained plenary powers (1326); but he died soon afterwards (1328).

Galeazzo and other Ghibellines had appealed to Louis the Bavarian, who had triumphed over his rival in Germany; and Louis sent a vicar into Italy. Thereupon (October 1323) John XXII enjoined Louis, on pain of excommunication, to abstain, pending the Papal decision, from the administration of the Empire, or from lending his support to the enemies of the Church, and especially to the Visconti, and within three months to present himself before the pontiff. Louis protested, and on being excommunicated by the Pope (March 1324) he appealed to a future Council, accusing the Pope of heresy on the ground of his decision in respect of Franciscan poverty.

In the Franciscan Order the division between the Moderates and the Spirituals had become accentuated (§§ 49, 58). Clement V took steps against the Spirituals; John XXII acted still more vigorously, so that one section of the Spirituals actually gave rise to a new heresy,

that of the Fraticelli. John also came into conflict with the more temperate party, declaring heretical the proposition that Christ and the Apostles were without possessions (1323).

The Pope declared that Louis was deprived of all rights accruing to him from the election; he further excommunicated him, laid the interdict on his partisans, and urged the electors to hold a new election, proposing the candidature of Charles IV of France. To the support which Louis received from the ascetic tendencies of the time must be added that afforded by the reviving sense of nationality in Germany, and lastly, by the formulation of new theories regarding the pontificate and its relations to civil authority. In 1326 Marsilius of Padua, a physician who had formerly been rector of the University of Paris, and John of Jandun (in Sciampagna) submitted to Louis of Bavaria the famous *Defensor Pacis*, drafted and written by Marsilius with assistance from John. This book is a manifestation of frank opposition to Roman Catholicism, in the name of popular and State rights. Starting from the principle of the sovereignty of the people, it plainly asserts that the Church has been transformed from the community of the faithful into a sacerdotal institution, whereas all believers ought to be regarded as "viri ecclesiastici." The supreme authority of the Church is therefore the General Council of all the faithful, and this alone has the right to expound the Holy Scriptures. In every realm there should be a single prince, dependent solely on election by the community; and it is the duty of the civil power to confer ecclesiastical preferment and in general to supervise the entire activity of the clergy. All bishops are equal, and they can excommunicate the Pope; the primacy of the latter is not a divine institution, and it is even doubtful whether he is the successor of St. Peter, as it is not certain whether St. Peter came to Rome. Moreover, the inferior clergy are free in respect of the episcopal power. No constraint or inquisition should be exercised in matters of belief; and ecclesiastical possessions may be used for purposes of public utility.

This was truly a reversal of all the mediaeval ideals. But the society of the 14th century was not ripe for such a revolution, and the book did not exert much influence at the time of its publication. More influential than Marsilius was the English Franciscan William of



Occam, who maintained the parity of Papacy and Empire, and the limitation of the first to the purely spiritual sphere. Similar theories were inculcated by the three most eminent Italian jurists of the 14th century: Cino da Pistoia (§ 63), Bartolo da Sassoferrato (1314-1357) and Baldo degli Ubaldi (1327-1400), the second of whom, in particular, enjoyed a wide reputation even in the transalpine schools. As against the work of such writers the theocratic theory was carried to extremes by the Augustinian Agostino Trionfo and the Minorite Pelagius, who maintained that the Pope possessed all plenary powers, and was the supreme monarch, the Emperor being his vassal.

Louis the Bavarian entered Lombardy in the spring of 1327, and was crowned King of Italy in Milan, on the 31 May, which was Whit-Sunday, by three bishops who had been excommunicated by the Pope. In July he had Galeazzo and his brothers Luchino and Giovanni thrown into prison, apparently because he suspected them of dealings with the Pope, and at the instigation of their elder brother Marco and their cousin Lodrisio; after which he instituted an aristocratic government, with a German vicar and *podestà*. He exacted large sums of money from the city, and also from the Ghibellines in general. Such actions were beginning to excite ill-feeling. Proceeding into Tuscany he occupied Pisa; he did not give the city to Castruccio, who coveted it, but he made him Duke of Lucca. He then marched upon Rome, where a rebellion had broken out against King Robert, who was senator of Rome, while a popular government had been constituted with Sciarra Colonna at its head.

In a *parlamento* which assembled in Campodoglio Louis, in accordance with the theories of Marsilius, sought acknowledgement from the Roman people, who proclaimed him captain, senator and emperor (January 1328). From Sciarra Colonna (17 January) he received the imperial crown, and here again the ceremonies of consecration were performed by two excommunicate bishops. The Pope then proclaimed the crusade against him. In reply, the *parlamento* of the people, in which Louis was then legislating, proclaimed the deposition of John as guilty of heresy and *lesa maestà* (*lèse majesté*: April), and at the instance of Louis the clergy and the Roman people elected as Pope the Franciscan Pietro da Corvara, Nicholas V (12 May); and his

election having been confirmed by Louis, the new Pope crowned him anew. But he was a mere simulacrum of a Pope, whom no one took seriously, and two years later (1330) he made submission to John XXII.

Louis had intended to march upon Naples, but he had neither the troops nor the money for such a venture. Castruccio deserted him to hurry into Tuscany, where he had lost Pistoia; he made himself lord of Pisa and regained Pistoia, but he died soon afterwards (September 1328). In August Louis had begun to move northwards; on reaching Pisa and Lucca he dispossessed Castruccio's sons and levied contributions. In the spring of 1329 he returned to Lombardy. He had already effected a reconciliation with the Visconti, and in return for a payment of 60,000 florins he had conferred the vicariate on Azzone, the son of Galeazzo, who had died in August 1328. Azzone, however, in conjunction with the Este, had thoughts of effecting a reconciliation with the Pope, and showed himself hostile to the Bavarian, who thereupon turned against Milan. But abandoned by almost all his followers, he was forced to make peace with Azzone, and in December 1329 he left Italy, never again to set foot on Italian soil.

The conflict between Louis and the Papacy continued for a long while after his departure, but without any real influence over events in Italy. Notwithstanding the claim of the German princes and the imperial Diet, that the German crown and the imperial power were independent of the Papacy (1338), a Papal candidate arose as a rival to Louis: Charles of Luxemburg (1346), son of John, King of Bohemia, who was the son of Henry VII. Charles made cession of Ferrara to the Church, and declared Provence (the possession of the Angevins) independent of the Empire. On the death of Louis in 1347 he was acknowledged by all, and in 1355 he went to Rome to receive the imperial crown.

§ 60. THE TRIUMPH OF ITALIAN PARTICULARISM.—Although the Emperors had actually renounced their claim to concern themselves with Italian affairs, the conflict between the Guelfs and the Ghibellines was not ended. For centuries to come these names were still applied to the cities, at war among themselves, and also to the factions within

the cities. But the great Lombard and Tuscan Leagues, arrayed against each other under the Guelf and Ghibelline standards, were relaxing their bonds and dissolving, being replaced by new groups of cities, determined mainly by mutual rivalry and the politics of the more powerful *signorie*.

But soon after Louis' departure the war which the Pope and Cardinal Bertrando del Poggetto, acting on his behalf, were waging in Lombardy against the Visconti came to an end. Excommunications and interdicts were revoked, and Azzone exchanged the title of vicar imperial for that of vicar pontifical: each title in turn being the price of his peaceful possession of Milan, of which city he was once more proclaimed the lord. The Este too made their peace with the Pope, receiving the vicariate in Ferrara (1329). For a little while, however, a new political power—German, like the imperial power—appeared to be striving to assert itself in Upper Italy, and to acquire a position of preponderance there. John of Luxemburg, King of Bohemia (§ 59), who had interests in the Tyrol, received an appeal for assistance from the Guelf city of Brescia, hard pressed by Mastino della Scala and other Ghibelline forces. John answered the appeal, and rescued the city (1530), afterwards effecting a reconciliation between its Guelfs and Ghibellines. There followed a movement of revolt in the lesser cities of Lombardy—wearied of continual conflicts, and eager to react against the great *signorie*—which sought to place themselves under the protection of King John. Becoming lord of Bergamo, Crema, Pavia, Vercelli, Novara, Parma, Reggio and Modena, he marched into Tuscany, where Lucca had surrendered itself into his hands, in order to save itself from the Florentines and the Pisans, who were contending for its possession. Azzone himself thought it well to proclaim him lord of Milan, though as John's vicar he kept the effective power of government in his own hands (February 1331).

The establishment of this power, which threatened to extend itself throughout the whole of Upper Italy, and even further, and to found a German kingdom on Italian soil, was bound to excite a reaction. Fear and suspicion were aroused when John had an interview with the Papal legate, Cardinal del Poggetto, after which he proceeded to Avignon. The doubters feared an agreement between the king and

the pontiff, who might seek to destroy the independence of the cities and the Italian *signori*; the more so as Bertrand del Rogetto—whom the Pope had created Count of Romagna and Marquis of Ancona—was diligently striving to extend his dominion in Romagna. In August 1332 a league was formed between Azzone Visconti, Mastino della Scala, Luigi Gonzaga (who since 1328 had been lord of Mantua) and the Marquises of Este: and this league was presently joined by the Florentines and the King of Naples. Poggetto, having attacked Ferrara, suffered a bloody defeat, which was a signal for a general revolt against him in Romagna. As for John, after some inconclusive actions against Azzone he signed a truce with the League, and returned to Germany (1333). He made no further attempts upon Italy, and in the following year the cardinal also left the country.

And now the question arose, how should the allies divide the spoils?—that is, the cities of which King John had held the *signoria*, and in which he had left his vicars. Disputes arose, excited more especially by the great ambition of Mastino della Scala, who together with his brother Alberto possessed the *signoria* of a dozen cities in the Trevisan March, and Lombardy, and even in Tuscany: among them being Verona, Vicenza, Padua, Brescia, Reggio and Lucca. It was rumoured that Mastino had had a crown made for him, which he would wear as King of Lombardy. A league was formed against the two Scaliger brothers (March 1337), which included—besides the Visconti, the Esté and the Gonzaga—on the one hand Venice (prejudiced by certain economic measures of Mastino's), and on the other, Florence; while the Luxemburgers joined it as lords of the Tyrol and Carinthia. The Scaligers were defeated; owing to the treachery of one of their followers Marsilio da Carrara made himself lord of Padua; Azzone Visconti took possession of Brescia; while Feltre and Belluno were taken by Charles of Luxemburg. Mastino was therefore compelled to accept a peace, concluded in Venice (in January 1339), by which he had to surrender Treviso to Venice and Bassano to Ubertino da Carrara, who had succeeded to Marsilio; the Florentines, however, did not obtain the coveted Lucca, but had to content themselves with some part of the Lucchese territory. Mastino subsequently lost Parma also (1341), the Da Correggio becoming its *signori*; and he then sold

Lucca to the Florentines. But the Pisans—with the aid of the Visconti, the Carraresi, and other Lombard *signori*—laid siege to the city and took possession of it (1342).

The fall of the Scaligers was contemporaneous with the rise of the Visconti. After a period of uncertainty under Galeazzo the Visconti had consolidated their position, and already, under Azzone, they had begun to extend their power; while after the defeat of the Scaligers they finally emerged as the rulers of by far the most powerful State in Upper Italy. Azzone (1328–1339) ruled over Milan, Como, and Vercelli, to say nothing of Pavia, Lodi, Piacenza, Cremona, Crema, Bergamo, Brescia, and other smaller cities. He had two treacherous enemies in his uncles Marco and Lodrisio; but the former died mysteriously in 1329, while the latter, who ten years later led the Company of St. George against Milan, was utterly defeated at Parabiago by Luchino, another of Azzone's uncles (February 1339), when he was taken prisoner, to be liberated after some years of captivity.

Six months later (August 1339) Azzone died, greatly regretted, as a pious, chaste, just and merciful ruler, intent on preserving peace among the citizens and on fortifying and embellishing the State with fortresses, bridges and palaces. His wife Caterina, the daughter of a Savoyard prince, had not given him a son; and the Milanese elected as *signori* his two uncles, the brothers of Galeazzo: Luchino, and Giovanni, the Archbishop of Milan; the latter left the government of the city to his brother.

Florence, after the loss of Lucca, passed through a period of internal revolution and external loss of power. The discontent aroused in the city by the failure of the expedition against Lucca, which had involved heavy expenditure, and the imposition of onerous taxation, now turned against the government, which was mainly in the hands of the *popolo grasso*. The result of this discontent was that Walter of Brienne, Duke of Athens (§ 59), who had been captain-general of the troops during the war, was tumultuously acclaimed as *signore* for life, with the support of the *popolo minuto* and the nobles, in a *parlamento* in Piazza Santa Croce (8 September 1342). The *grandi* led their new lord to the palace of the Priors, from which the duke expelled the latter, who had thenceforth to meet in a private house. The

College of Priors having been reorganized, the duke introduced representatives of the *popolo minuto*, who gave the preference to members of the nobility. However, the *gonfalonieri* in command of the *Compagnie del popolo* were abolished, while the duke strengthened his position by the employment of French and Burgundian mercenaries. His right-hand man was the Captain of the People, Guglielmo d'Assisi. Walter was also *signore* for life of Pistoia, Volterra, and Arezzo (which the Florentines had acquired some years earlier from the Tarlati). He concluded a five years' peace with Pisa, by which Pisa retained possession of Lucca, while the Florentines were given the right to trade in Pisa. He also made treaties with Bologna, the Este, and the Scaligers.

The discontent of the dispossessed party (the *popolo grasso*) and the nobles, disappointed in their expectations, very soon extended to the whole population. Among the causes of this discontent were: the licentious attacks of the duke's followers upon the honour of Florentine women; the financial administration of the duke, who, intent on filling the treasury, deprived the creditors of the State of their due revenues, while he imposed fresh taxes and levied prestations; and the acts of positive tyranny committed by his tool, Guglielmo d'Assisi, who sentenced to death or mutilation any who attempted to speak a word against the government. These conspiracies were formed in different classes of society, each independent of the others, but presently, combining together, the conspirators broke into open rebellion (26 July 1343). At the same time the other Tuscan cities under Walter's lordship rose against him. The duke began by attempting to appease the insurgents by surrendering Guglielmo and his son, who were torn to pieces by the infuriated populace. Finally, on the 3 August he surrendered, leaving the palace and the city. During the insurrection a commission of fourteen citizens was elected—seven *grandi* and seven *popolani*—as a provisional government, with plenary powers—or *balìa*—to reform the State. This commission of the Fourteen began by abrogating all the decrees and laws of the fallen tyrant. It then divided the civic offices into major and minor. The first (the offices of priors, councillor to the priors, *gonfaloniere*) could be filled by the nobles and *popolani grassi*; while the

*popolo minuto* could fill only the second class of office. The city was divided into wards (*quartieri*), and to each ward were assigned two of the *priori popolani* and one of the *grandi*, making twelve in all, while the council of the Priors, or of the Signoria, consisted of equal numbers of *grandi* and *popolani*. The agreement between *grandi* and *popolani* was, however, of brief duration, and in September a popular rising expelled the nobles from the Priorate and the Council. The *popolo minuto* then asserted themselves, having gained greatly in self-confidence by the part which they had played in the elevation and overthrow of the Duke of Athens. Taking up arms, they overcame the last resistance of the nobles, and proceeded to make a new division of the priorate, with two *popolani grassi*, three *mediani*, and three of the *popolo minuto*, corresponding to the three groups into which the *arti* were divided (§ 56). The *gonfaloniere* of justice was to be drawn from the three classes in rotation.

During these years the *popolo grasso* was weakened by the failure of certain bankers, first among whom were the Bardi and the Peruzzi. They had made enormous loans to the King of England, but could not obtain repayment, owing to the war with France (the Hundred Years' War). Further, the King of France, at the instigation of the Duke of Athens, expelled from his kingdom all Florentine bankers and merchants who were not naturalized. In order to hold their own against the *popolo minuto* the *popolo grasso* had recourse to such expedients as excluding from office all "foreigners" (of whom there were many among the *plebs*) and ensuring, by means of the Guelf captains of the people, a rigorous exclusion of the Ghibellines.

Meanwhile, in respect of the outer world, Florence was compelled to practise a policy of concentration. The independence of Pistoia and Arezzo was recognized, Pietrasanta was ceded to the Bishop of Lucca, and an agreement was concluded with Pisa, by which Lucca was renounced on payment of an indemnity.

A period of decadence, much longer and more actual, was now beginning for the kingdom of Naples. Robert of Anjou, in the first part of his reign, had aspired, not without some reason, to supremacy in Italy, counting on the support of the Guelf party, at whose head he had placed himself. To the kingdom of Southern Italy and the

dominions of Piedmont and Provence he succeeded in adding, for a time, the lordships of Rome, Florence and Genoa. These *signorie*, however, were ephemeral; in Rome the Ghibelline faction won the upper hand; in Florence, after the death of Charles of Calabria (November 1328) the power of the Angevins was ended; while in Genoa a general rising of the population (1335) abolished the Angevin rule. After 1330 the Angevin government of Piedmont collapsed, the Marquis of Monferrato being the chief gainer by its fall. The failure of Louis' expedition had led, in Upper Italy, not to the supremacy of King Robert, but to the consolidation of the more powerful local *signorie*, especially those of the Visconti. The success of the Visconti, then, together with the autonomy of Florence—irreducible, despite all its Guelfism—were the chief obstacles to the imperialistic designs of Robert of Anjou.

To these obstacles must be added the dispersion and wasting of forces resulting from the Sicilian war. King Robert had never renounced his hope of recovering Sicily, where King Frederick of Aragon, contrary to the stipulations of the Peace of Caltabellotta (§ 55), had obtained the acknowledgement of his son Pedro as his successor, and had allied himself successively with Henry VII and Louis the Bavarian, and also with the Visconti and other Ghibellines, and had, of course, been excommunicated by Pope John. The war dragged on inconclusively, greatly to the detriment of both kingdoms, with reciprocal incursions and landings on the coasts, while Robert instigated and aided the Sicilian exiles and rebels. In 1337 Frederick died, and was succeeded by Peter II (1337–1342), despite a pontifical sentence which declared that Sicily had devolved upon King Robert. Peter was followed by Louis (1342–1355). In January 1342 King Robert died. He was nearly eighty years of age. He left his kingdom in a state of internal disorder: mainly because the nobles had taken advantage of the frequent absences of the king, and his absorption in foreign wars, to increase their own power at the cost of the royal authority and the good administration of the State.



## CHAPTER X

### *THE VISCONTI, FLORENCE, AND THE PAPACY*

§ 61. THE CHARACTER OF THE SIGNORIE.—The decline of the great Leagues, and the subsidence of the conflict between Guelfs and Ghibellines, which had involved whole regions of Italy, and had even extended throughout the country, and the failure (connected with the above factors) of the Angevin policy of hegemony, marked the beginning of a period of Italian history in which the predominant phenomenon was the development of the local and regional *signorie*, and in which Italian autonomism finally took root. The transformation of commune into *signoria*, which began in Northern Italy in the 13th century, was completed there in the 14th century, when it was extended to Central Italy. In Upper Italy the two most powerful *signorie* were that of the Visconti in Lombardy and that of the Scaligers in Venetia. Intermediate between the two, but much less important, was that of the Gonzaga in Mantua, while to the east of the Scaligers was the *signoria* of the Carraresi in Padua. In a number of other Lombard cities there were the temporary *signorie* of various noble families, which afterwards disappeared, absorbed into the greater *signorie*. In Bologna the Pepoli were the *signori*. The feudal domains of Piedmont assumed very largely the character of communal *signorie*, for in addition to the ancient feudal domains of Monferrato or Savoy there were communes which surrendered themselves to a lord. In Tuscany, as we saw, there were the *signorie* of Ugucione and Castruccio in Lucca, Pisa and Pistoia, and we shall hear of others; while in Florence, as in Genoa, there were temporary *signorie* which did not destroy the communal structure or the popular liberties.

The institution of the *signoria* might be administered in very different ways. Sometimes the *podestà* or other citizen magistrate (and more particularly the Captain of the People or the holder of some

other office at the head of the popular party) transformed the temporary office into an office for life; sometimes, in the struggle between the factions, the victorious faction proclaimed its leader *signore* of the city; while in other cases a *signore* of external origin was proclaimed, in order that the head of the government might be above the factions. In some cases, then, the *signore* was a citizen, and in others a "foreigner." There were, of course, plenty of actual *coups de force*, by which some prominent citizen, some lord of a castle, some captain of soldiery seized the reins of government. Even in such cases the popular assembly was convoked to ratify the accomplished fact, so that the legal principle on which the *signoria* was based was not other than the basic principle of the commune; namely, the will and consent of the people. This, however, was commonly expressed by the summary acclamations of the general assembly convoked by order of the triumphant faction. The popular acclamation was followed—very much as in the case of the communal magistrates—by the recognition of the Empire; that is, by the concession of the imperial vicariate (or in pontifical territories, by the Papal recognition and the Papal vicariate). The *signori* betrayed a tendency to regard this investiture from above as more essential than the nomination by the people, in order that their authority might be greater and more independent of the citizens. These civic or imperial investitures, and the institution of *signoria* in general, did not exclude the continuance, at least for a variable period, of the republican institutions and the republican magistrates; unless these became mere empty forms and lost their autonomy, when the signorial power, in its effective basis and its actual functioning, was absolute and monarchical. It was supported by mercenary troops of extraneous origin (cf. § 67), which were often garrisoned in the citadel or castle built by the *signore* in order to dominate the city. The people were excluded from the functions of government, and in general from participation in political life; so that the process of political development and education initiated by the communes was checked and destroyed for centuries. The monarchical institution of the *signoria* reached its full development with the hereditary transmission of signorial power. *De facto* preceded *de jure* inheritance, and was sanctioned in its turn by the people or the emperor.

The leading characteristic of the *signoria*, over and above the concentration of power, and its absolute nature, was the fact that it put an end to party government, even where it had emerged from the victory of one faction over the other. Just as it was able to act independently of the parties, so it could behave impartially in respect of the different social classes; and it was in its interest to do so. The nobility was the class least trusted and most oppressed by the signorial government; while the wealthy middle class enjoyed the advantages of greater security and social tranquillity. The *popolo minuto*, who had played but little part, or none at all, in the communal government, derived some advantage from the signorial government, and constituted its most faithful supporters against discontent, disorder, and the conspiracies of the dispossessed upper classes.

The smaller cities, and those towns or villages which were subject to the larger cities, also derived some advantage from the transformation. Sometimes the *signore* governed them by virtue of the power formerly exercised by the great city; in other cases he was the first to unite the various towns under his government, being proclaimed *signore* independently by the citizens of the different communities; a course which was followed more especially in the larger *signorie*. (Sometimes two or more *signori* governed the same city in condominium; sometimes one *signore* sold his *signoria* to another.) On the whole, one may point to a coincidence—of great historical importance—between the establishment of the *signoria* in a single city and the grouping of this and other cities under a single dominion. By the second process the different populations were to a certain extent placed on an equal footing under the personal rule of their common *signore*, while the *signoria* came to be a conglomerate of communes, governed in the signorial manner by the same person. In the course of time the mere personal union was transformed into a more intimate fusion; the individual local autonomies being replaced by uniform institutions and common magistrates, through whom the *signore* asserted his own will and published his administrative measures. Above, or in the place of, the old elective magistrature, a uniform and centralized bureaucracy was beginning to take shape. The *signoria* therefore represented a first step toward the modern state, both in

the wider extension and in the organization of the government. The type of the communal state, in which the state coincided with the city, was replaced by the regional state with a central government, which certainly had its seat in the city, but was no longer identified with the government of the city, being something that was common to the whole territory.

§ 62. THE "COMPAGNIE DI VENTURA."—The formation of the *signorie* was accompanied by an increase in the numbers of mercenary troops, and their transformation into the *Compagnie di ventura*—"Companies of fortune" or "companies of adventure."

The communes, in their early stages, made provision for their military operations, whether defensive or offensive, by calling upon the citizens to take up arms. The citizens were generally mustered according to their wards and were united under the command of the citizen magistrates. This citizen militia was unpaid, and its members had to provide their own rations. It consisted of knights or horsemen heavily armed (with cuirass, etc.) and lightly armed foot-soldiers; but the latter were more numerous, as the cavalry was too expensive, and more difficult to handle, consisting mainly of feudatories, who were only partly and incompletely subjected to the city. The citizens, then, who should have been attending to their business or their handicraft, suffered serious loss through being called up. In short, the communal militia, being occasional soldiers, imperfectly trained, and also inadequately armed, were not fitted for the conduct of long and arduous wars. They were even less useful when the cavalry became more efficient, and so heavily armed that the infantry was no longer able to offer effective resistance.

Before long, therefore, the communes began to enrol mercenaries, including even the feudal *signori* themselves, who were eager for gain or were moved by love of adventure. At first these troops consisted of men recruited by driblets, or small companies hastily raised when they were needed. It followed, of course, that they were accompanied by the *podestà*, who were of extraneous origin; or the cities chose a "foreign" captain to command their army, and this captain brought with him a nucleus of mercenaries. Gradually the citizens began to

abstain almost completely from service in the field, while the mercenary companies grew larger and larger, led by a commander who was employed, with all his men, in the service of the city, or, as the phrase ran, was taken a *condotta*, whence the name of *condottiero*. These large forces, which marched from one region of Italy to another, or even from one European country to another, came to be known as *Compagnie di ventura* ("Companies of fortune"). Avid of booty, often ill paid, or unpunctually, they were composed very largely of the scum of society: ferocious and unscrupulous, they were bound by no moral tie to the countries through which they passed, so that it is easy to understand what a scourge they must have been to those unfortunate regions, for their passage was marked by looting, rape, massacre, and crushing exactions. In a large and powerful State like France they were controlled or eliminated; but in Italy, divided into a number of large, small, and very small states perpetually at war among themselves, they had things all their own way, and became, so to speak, so many wandering and destroying states, with whom the communes and the *signori* had to come to terms.

The harm done by these companies was aggravated by the fact that in the beginning, and for a long while afterwards, they consisted of foreigners, and were usually commanded by foreign captains. Catalan mercenaries in the pay of King Frederick took part in the War of the Vespers; and they, being disbanded after the Peace of Caltabellotta (1302), combined to form the Company of the *Almogàveri* (an Arabic word), and then proceeded to the Orient. But the German mercenaries who had been employed by Henry VII, Louis the Bavarian, and John of Bohemia remained in Italy, and forming themselves into companies which as yet were of no great strength, they entered into the service of various Italian *signori*: Visconti, Scaligeri, Uguccione, Castruccio. Now these companies became larger, more closely knit, and more independent, and among their commanders were men like the two Visconti, Marco and Lodrisio. There was, for instance, the Company of the Dove, which about the year 1335 was devastating Tuscany, and the larger Company of St. George, commanded by Lodrisio Visconti (§ 60). From about 1340 onwards there appeared in Italy a whole series of foreign "captains of fortune," at the head of very large

companies: Guarnerius (Werner), Duke of Urslingen, a German, whose cuirass was inscribed, in letters of silver, with the words: "Nemico di Diò e di misericordia" (Enemy of God and of mercy), who was a captain of the "Great Company"; the Provençal ex-Templar Montréal, known as Fra Moriale; the Count of Landau, or Count Lando; Anichino di Baumgarten; and lastly, the Englishman John Hawkwood, "l'Acuto," a man of higher moral standards.

§ 63. THE APOGEE OF THE COMMUNAL CIVILIZATION.—The Italian civilization of the communal period reached its apogee when the commune itself, as a political institution, was beginning to decline throughout the greater part of Italy. This was to some extent a manifestation of a well-known historical phenomenon, which might be described as the principle of delayed action; according to which the fruits of political and economic activity require a certain time to manifest themselves in the sphere of culture (and sometimes the inverse phenomenon may be observed). Yet it should be noted that the Italian civilization of this period flourished most conspicuously in Florence and the cities of Tuscany, where the commune still retained its vitality. For both these reasons this civilization may with perfect justification be described as the communal civilization.

From the middle of the 13th to the middle of the 14th century Latin literature continued to flourish, and was closely associated with the life of the nation. In the theological and philosophical sphere Italy had hitherto been definitely inferior to France. Now, in the middle of the 13th century, she came to the front with the Dominican Thomas Aquinas (1225 or 26–1274) and the Franciscan Bonaventura di Bagnorea (1221–1274), who was general of his Order and a cardinal. The *Summa contra Gentiles*, and above all the *Summa Theologiae* of Aquinas—to say nothing of a great number of other works—quickly became classics, thanks to their lucid and judicial style. "Thomism," which is a Christianized Aristotelism, retaining some elements of Augustinianism and Christian Platonism, became and remained one of the dominant influences in the sphere of Catholic thought, and in our own days it has become the official theology of the Roman Church. The writings of Bonaventura, whose most considerable work was the

*Commentarii* on the "Book of Sentences" of Peter Lombard (§ 47), as compared with the Christian rationalism of Aquinas, were faithful rather to Augustinianism and Platonism, with a tendency to intuitive mysticism. In a series of other works he developed the mystical doctrines of the Victorines and of Gallo (§ 47), describing the successive stages by which the human spirit may raise itself to God (*Septem gradus contemplationis, Itinerarium mentis ad Deum*).

Both writers were active in the field of Biblical exegesis (and here we must mention Gregory of Rimini, general of the Augustinians, *d.* 1338); they also wrote sermons on exegetical motives, as did a whole series of other preachers, among whom we may mention the two Dominicans, Ugo da Prato (*d.* 1322) and Bartolomeo da San Concordia, near Pisa (*d.* 1347). Thomas Aquinas has left us also a classic treatise on the political and Christian theory of the Middle Ages in his *De Regimine principum*, the second part of which, however, is by Tolomeo da Lucca. The same title is borne by a treatise on the education of princes by the Augustinian Egidio Romano (*d.* 1316).

In the field of canon law the new collection of Papal decretals issued by Gregory IX (§ 48) gave rise to many commentaries; and these were followed by other commentaries on the final collection of the *Estravaganti* of John XXII (§ 59). One of the most famous of these writers on canon law was Giovanni di Andrea del Mugella (*d.* 1348), a professor at Bologna and a friend of Petrarch. But in the field of juridical literature secular learning began to replace ecclesiastical in the work of those writers who, studying the Roman law, were abandoning the antiquated gloss for the ampler commentary, and for freer elaborations of the traditional texts, in accordance with the new social realities. Among such writers were Francesco Accursio the younger (*d.* 1293) and Odofredo di Bologna (*d.* 1265), and above all the three great authorities of whom we have already made mention (§ 59), Cino, Bartolo and Baldo. Rolandino Passaggeri di Bologna (*d.* 1300) compiled manuals of the notary's profession, which played so important a part in the life of the communes.

The other secular science which was especially cultivated in Italy—that of medicine—continued to produce an abundant literature. A *Summa curationis* containing clinical histories was compiled by

Guglielmo Saliceti of Piacenza (*d.* 1276); a *Practica*, applying the scholastico-deductive method, was published by the Papal physician, William of Brescia (*c.* 1300); and prescriptions of a special character were compiled by Guglielmo Varignana of Brescia (*d.* 1330) in his *Secreta medicinae*.

But the most flourishing department of Latin letters was now, more than ever, historical literature: which included a vast number of religious and ecclesiastical histories. In the *Legenda aurea*, the "Golden Legend" of Jacopo da Varagine (Varazze, near Savona), Archbishop of Genoa (*d.* 1298), we have a collection of legends of saints, arranged in accordance with the ecclesiastical calendar, which has become a classic. The *Historia ecclesiastica* of Ptolemy of Lucca, which comes down to the year 1312, had a very great vogue, although (or perhaps because) it made use of other well-known histories.

But the output of profane history was beyond all comparison larger and more important. It included the chronicles of the various cities: the *Annales Veronenses* of Parisio di Cereta (down to 1297); the *Chronicon Genuense* of Jacopo da Varagine (down to 1297); the *Manipulus florum* of Galvaneo Fiamma, dealing with Milanese history down to 1334; the *Historia de situ, origine et cultoribus Ambrosianae urbis* of Giovanni di Cermenate (down to 1313); and the *Chronicon venetum* of the Doge Andrea Dandolo (down to 1339). More important, more vital, more truly historical, and yet at the same time works of art, were the histories in which various writers dealt more especially with contemporary events. These writers of this class were from the south: the Ghibelline Bartolomeo di Neocastro, author of *Historia sicula* (1250-1294); Nicolo di Iamsilla, author of *Historia de rebus Friderici II eiusque filiorum* (1210-1258); and the Guelf Saba Malaspina, author of *Rerum sicularum libri* (1250-1276). In Upper Italy the Minorite Salimbene of Parma produced a masterpiece of communal history in his *Chronica* (1168-1287), which is unsurpassed for its versatile and vivacious description of the political and religious society of the day. Another valuable and characteristic history is the *Chronica* (*c.* 1180-1260) of Rolandino of Padua, which contains documents and even poems of the period. A historical work of high literary value is the *Historia Augusta* of the distinguished poet and jurist,



Albertino Mussato of Padua, dedicated to the descendants of Henry VII; and with this may be coupled the *Historia* (1250-1318) of the notary Ferreto of Vicenza.

The great geographical explorations on which Italians were beginning to embark at this period, at first mainly for reasons of religious propaganda, gave rise to a literature of a novel type, describing distant lands and peoples. Such was the *Historia Mongolorum* of the Franciscan friar, Giovanni di Pian del Carpine (*d.* 1252). The most celebrated work of this kind, the *Milione* of Marco Polo, was written in French.

The historical narrative might even assume the form of the Latin epic. Cardinal Giacomo Caetani wrote poems on the life of Celestine V and the election of Boniface VIII. The classic forms of the poetical epistle were revived by Dante and Giovanni del Virgilio in a mutual exchange of letters in verse. Albertino Mussato (see above) wrote a score of epistles or sermons. He was also an original precursor in his application of the forms of classical tragedy to contemporary figures (Ezzelino) in his *Ecerinis*. But the greatest Latin authors of this period were also the first writers in the vulgar tongue: Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio.

From the middle of the 13th century the Italian literature in the vulgar tongue began to reach its fullest development, and it very soon made up for the time lost in comparison with the literature of France. In this new literature the contemporary life of the Italian people found a direct and a fuller means of expression, now that the obstacle of the "learned tongue" was removed.

At first Italian literature was largely a reflection of French and Provençal literature. The poems of the so-called Sicilian school, of that group of poets which had gathered about Frederick II—among whom were Frederick himself, Suoz, and Pier delle Vigne—were mainly imitations of the lyrical poems of the troubadours. This lyrical school made its way into Tuscany, where it was modified by Guittone d'Arezzo (*d.* 1294) and others, until the "sweet new style" of Guido Guinizelli in Bologna (second half of the 13th century) and Guido Cavalcanti (the friend of Dante) in Florence created a new kind of love-lyric, characterized by a subtle psychological analysis, by an

idealistic conception of womanhood, and above all, by greater warmth and clarity of feeling. It was in this style that Dante wrote in his early youth. From the people, on the other hand, came the *laude sacra* inspired by the Franciscan movement and the Flagellants, the greatest exponent of which was Jacopone da Tode (*d.* 1306: § 58). From the lyrical *laude*, which was often a dialogue, there evolved in Umbria the dramatic *laude*, and the religious drama in the vulgar tongue.

The allegorical and didactic poetry of France inspired the Florentine Brunetto Latini, the master of Dante, in his *Tesoretto*; Latini also wrote the *Trésor* in French, one of the first popular encyclopaedias, which was quickly translated into Italian; and a good deal of the Italian prose of this period was moral and didactic in tone. But other forms of French prose became known in Italy, and inspired imitations; for example, the romances written round the heroes of antiquity, or those of the so-called Breton cycle, or those of the Arthurian legend; and also the collections of short stories (*novelle*), one of the best known being the *Novellino*, which were also to some extent influenced by the French romances and *fabliaux*.

After the close of the 13th century Italy made such rapid progress in culture that she presently stood at the summit of the mediaeval world, taking the place that had been occupied by France. The Italian culture of the fourteenth century, though it was still largely mediaeval, had yet a definitely secular character as regards its content and its authorship; indeed, one may say that it was the first great secular literature since the collapse of the ancient world. Both in this respect, and in the revival of classical culture, due above all to Petrarch, the Italian Trecento was the precursor of the Renaissance.

In speaking of the history of Florence and the advent of Henry VII (§ 59) we have already mentioned the great name of Dante Alighieri (1265–1321). The poet who was the greatest writer of the *dolce stil nuovo* (see above) in the *Vita nuova* and the *Canzoniere* has given us, in the *Divina Commedia*, the most powerful synthesis of the political, religious and artistic world of the Middle Ages, and also a most varied and impressive representation of the Italy of his day; a representation inspired by the longing for peace and harmony and civic justice, and by a passionate love of “the garden of the Empire.”

At one stroke he lifted the literature of the vulgar tongue to a level not inferior to that of the classics, and far above that of the other Romance literatures. Moreover, in the *Convivio* he wrote the first philosophical dissertation in the Italian tongue; in *De vulgari eloquentia* he initiated the scientific study of the Romance languages, and above all, of Italian; and in *De Monarchia*, where he expounded the principle of moderate Ghibellinism as against the Papal hierocracy (cf. § 59), he asserted the independence of the secular power. Francis Petrarch, born at Arezzo, the son of a Florentine father (1304–1374), in his *Canzoniere*, an offspring of the love-lyrics of Provence and the *dolce stil nuovo*, but wholly transformed by his own personality, subjected his most intimate emotions to a subtle psychological analysis, illustrating both here and elsewhere the conflict between the emerging modern mentality and the soul of the Middle Ages; while in his Latin works, which eloquently defended the cause of classical culture, he laid the foundations of a historical and aesthetic study of the classics which was no longer mediaeval, but modern. Lastly, Giovanni Boccaccio (1313–1375), yet another classical scholar, in his *Decamerone*, in which the material of the French *fabliaux* (see above) is completely absorbed by the original intuition of the artist, gave life to a whole world of characters, derived from the observation of everyday life, and wrote the great prose classic of the period.

Around these authors, but greatly inferior to them, and to a certain extent influenced by them, though some were more faithful to mediaeval traditions, were numbers of chroniclers, novelists, and poets, mostly Tuscan, who co-operated with them in the definitive formation of the literary language of Italy. The *dolce stil nuovo* made its final and by no means unsuccessful essays in the work of Cino da Pistoia (*d.* 1337), a member of the White party. In allegorical and didactic poetry, there was the *Fiore* of one Durante, a condensed version, in the form of 232 sonnets, of a famous French poem, the *Roman de la Rose*; *L'Intelligenza*, a poem possibly written by Dino Compagni (see below); and *L'Acerba*, a doctrinal poem by a famous astrologer, Cecco d'Ascoli, who died at the stake in 1327, and who in this poem had presumptuously sought to rival Dante. Humorous poetry, realistic and often satirical, and sometimes political

in content, found a highly individual exponent in Cecco Angiolieri of Siena, who exchanged aggressive sonnets with Dante, and sang of his loves and his unhappy life. Political poetry reached a very high level in the work of Fazio degli Uberti, who flourished about the middle of the century, a Ghibelline who called for the constitution of a national Italian monarchy, and who was also the author of a geographico-historical poem, the *Dittamondo*, which was to some extent an imitation of Dante. Various political poets presaged the union of Italy under the rule of Gian Galeazzo (Francesco di Vannezzo of Treviso, Simone Serdini of Siena, known as il Saviozzo, etc.).

The Trecento brought a rich harvest of ascetic prose, including the *Fioretti* of St. Francis, a delightful collection of Franciscan legends, and the work of two Dominican friars, Domenico Cavalca di Vicopisano (*d.* 1342), author of the *Vite dei Santi Padri*, and a number of ascetic treatises, and the Florentine Jacopo Passaventi (*d.* 1357), author of the *Specchio di vera penitenza*, and the dialogue *Della Divina Provvidenza* by St. Catherine of Siena, together with her many letters (§ 66). Among the novelists were Ser Giovanni Fiorentino, who wrote *Il Pecorone* in imitation of Boccaccio, while Franco Sacchetti, a Florentine (*d.* circa 1400), incorporated in his *novelle* a number of delightful anecdotes. A notable historical work was the *Cronica* of Dino Compagni, a White, a lively recital of the history of Florence about 1300, while the *Cronica* of another Florentine, Giovanni Villani (*d.* 1348) continues the tradition of the world-chronicle, beginning with the Tower of Babel; but the central portion of the narrative is the history of Florence, and it is a work of considerable importance in respect of contemporary events. It was continued by his brother Matteo and his nephew Filippo.

Latin literature also was cultivated by Petrarch and Boccaccio. Petrarch wrote a poem in hexameters, *Africa*, whose hero was Scipio Africanus, the whole poem being a glorification of the Roman world, *Egloghe*, in imitation of Virgil, and moral and ascetic works, the most important being the *Secretum* or *De contemptu mundi*, which is a lucid exposition of the spiritual conflict between the mediaeval man—a mystic—and the modern man, with his tendency to assert his mundane personality. Lastly, works of erudition, and a very copious and ex-

tremely important collection of letters. Boccaccio wrote in Latin certain learned treatises, and also some epistles and eclogues.

In the middle of the 13th century Gothic art, which had been flourishing for a century past in France, made its way into Italy. This is the most original manifestation of mediaeval art; that from which the antique elements have been most completely eliminated. Its fundamental characteristic is the tendency to employ the vertical line, which makes for agility and altitude, and the tendency to prefer apertures rather than unbroken surfaces; tendencies which find expression in the pointed arch as a constructive and ornamental element, and in the multiplication of windows and pilasters. As a result, the walls are less solid, and this necessitates the construction of the external buttresses which are, with the pointed arch, the two most obvious characteristics of the Gothic style. In the ornamentation of the Gothic style the imitation of nature, and vegetable motives in particular, prevail over the fantastic elements beloved of Romanic art. In Italy, however, the essential characteristics of Gothic are in general considerably attenuated; the tendency to great height is moderated; the horizontal line and the continuous wall are still prevalent; while there is hardly any employment of buttresses, turrets, or spires. The Gothic style was introduced into Italy mainly by the Cistercians and the mendicant Orders. Some of the finest monuments of the Italian architecture of this period are to be found in Florence: Santa Maria del Fiore, founded in 1296 by Arnolfo di Cambio (*d.* 1302), but continued in the 14th century; the campanile beside the Duomo, begun by Giotto (see below) in 1334, but mainly the work of Francesco Talenti; the Franciscan church of Santa Croce; and the Dominican church of Santa Maria Novella. In Siena there is a splendid monument of Italian Gothic in the Duomo, while the cathedral of Orvieto has a Gothic façade which is a masterpiece of polychromy, although the interior is still Romanic.

The Gothic style was extensively adopted in Italy for secular buildings, and especially for the palaces of the communes. Noteworthy examples are those of Florence and Siena, which were built at the end of the thirteenth century. The castles of Frederick II in the south (Castel del Monte) are fine examples of French Gothic.

In France the development of Gothic architecture was accompanied by a wealth of sculpture which shows a notable improvement on the Romanic sculpture, revealing a finer sense of form, a profounder depth of feeling, and greater freedom of handling. In the faces of this period the serenity of expression is conspicuous. Like the Romanic sculpture, this Gothic sculpture was employed principally in the ornamentation of the churches, where its aim was often instructive. We find scenes taken from the Scriptures and religious legends; personifications of the vices and virtues; the seasons; agricultural operations; and the apparatus of the arts and sciences.

The Italian sculpture of the Gothic period presents the same application and the same subjects. But in the beginning it produced imitations of antiquity; as in the work of Nicolo Pisano, who created the pulpit in the baptistery of Pisa (1260). His disciple, Arnolfo di Cambio (see above), combined classical tendencies with Gothic motives. A highly original and extremely powerful artist, Nicolo's son Giovanni Pisano (*d.* after 1320), in contrast to the cold and classical plasticity of his father, gave all his figures a flexuous Gothic mobility and a Gothic intensity of feeling (*cf.* the pulpits of Pistoia and Pisa, and a number of individual statues). Andrea da Pontedera, known as Andrea Pisano (*d.* 1348), sculptured the very beautiful bas-reliefs for Giotto's campanile in Florence.

Italian painting also, having finally broken away from the Byzantine tradition, reached a very high level about 1300. The Roman school, of which Pietro Cavallini was a representative, applied its knowledge of antique models in works distinguished by classic harmony and bold relief. The Sienese school, whose first great master was Duccio da Boninsegna (*d.* 1319), inherited the sinuous line and the decorative colour of the Byzantine tradition, while producing works of great originality. After Duccio, in the first half of the 14th century, it produced Simon Martini, and Pietro and Ambrogio Lorenzetti.

Lastly, the Florentine school, at the close of the 13th century, produced a painter distinguished for a certain monumental quality and for dramatic movement: Cimabue, who was surpassed—as Dante realized (*Purg.* c. XI)—by Giotto (1267–1337), who had formed himself on Cimabue and Cavallini, becoming one of the most in-

fluent and original personalities in the whole history of art. In the chapel of the Arena, Padua, in Santa Croce, Florence, and in San Francesco, Assisi, he has left us mural frescoes in which profound moral truth is expressed in vigorous plastic relief. After his time the school of Giotto was predominant not only in Florence, but throughout Italy, during the whole of the 14th century.

Among the Gothic artists of Florence may be mentioned Taddeo Gaddi, Andrea di Cione, known as Orcagna, and Bernardo Daddi, who was influenced by the school of Siena. Of non-Tuscan artists Altichiero of Verona, Guariento of Padua, and Barnaba and Tommaso of Modena may be mentioned.

§ 64. THE VISCONTI AND THE ANTI-VISCONTIAN COALITIONS.—As a rule, Luchino (1339–1349) was just, but far more severe than Azzone, and jealous of power. He was suspicious of the friends and ministers of Azzone, among whom was one Francesco da Pusterla, who formed a conspiracy with a number of nobles, who were discontented with the strictly impartial government of Luchino. The conspiracy was discovered; Pusterla himself, who had at first fled to Avignon, was lured to Pisa by a trick, and arrested there; he was put to death, with his accomplices, in Milan. After this Luchino's *signoria* was undisturbed.

Outside Milan, Luchino increased the Viscontian dominions by the inclusion of Asti and Bobbio, the *signoria* of Pavia, and Parma, disputed by Luchino and Obizzo d'Este in a war (1345–1346) in which the Gonzaga and Scaligeri took part, and which ended with the cession of Parma by Obizzo to Luchino. After this successful campaign Tortona, Alessandria, Alba, Cherasco and certain minor territories in Piedmont and Lunigiane spontaneously added themselves to Luchino.

On his death his brother Giovanni, Archbishop of Milan, assumed the political government (1349–1354). He was a munificent ruler, who protected the arts and the sciences, and cultivated the friendship of Petrarch. He extended the rule, or at least the influence of the Visconti, into Emilia, Tuscany, and Liguria. The Pepoli, the lords of Bologna, pressed by the Count of Romagna, the representative of the pontiff, had Giovanni proclaimed *signore* in consideration of a payment of

200,000 florins (1350), and Giovanni obtained the vicariate from the pontiff by the expenditure of some further hundreds of thousands. By the acquisition of Bologna Visconti procured a base for subsequent action in Tuscany; and he immediately entered into relations with the Ghibelline Tarlati, formerly lords of Arezzo, and other Tuscan feudatories. Florence then (1351) formed a league against these *signori* with Siena, Arezzo and Perugia, and also succeeded (1351) in reconquering Pistoia. The Tuscan League, however, was not very effective; and in 1353 it made peace with its Ghibelline adversaries. It failed to hold its own against the hordes of the *condottiero* Fra Moriale, to whom the larger Tuscan cities, including Florence, had to pay heavy ransom (1354).

Of greater immediate importance in respect of Italian politics was Visconti's acquisition of Genoa, which involved Lombardy in the conflict between Genoa and Venice, and had the effect of tightening the political bonds between Venice and the mainland.

The internal division of the Genoese nobility into Guelfs (to which party the Fieschi and the Grimaldi belonged) and the Ghibellines (among whom were the Doria and the Spinola) had led the city to surrender itself *in signoria* to King Robert of Naples, where the Guelf faction, victorious at home, was looking for aid against the exiled Ghibellines, who were supported by the Lombard Ghibellines. The civil war extended to the foreign possessions and the commercial outposts of the city, so that some of them were in the hands of the Guelfs and some in those of the Ghibellines. The two factions, however, made peace, owing to the efforts of the king (1331), in order to fight side by side against the King of Aragon, who had made himself the master of Sardinia (1322-1324), in which he was enfeoffed by the Pope, and whose Catalan subjects were the rivals and enemies of the Genoese. Very soon, however, there was a renewal of hostilities within the city, and this time they resulted in the victory of the Ghibellines and the end of the Angevin lordship (1335). The city then concluded peace with Aragon (1336).

These quarrels were mainly the concern of the nobles; but now the people began to show their power. In September 1339, when they nominated their "abbot" (§ 53), they acclaimed the noble Simone



Boccanegra supreme head of the city, with the title of Doge. As a result of the conflict between the noble and the popular elements the Doge's council was sometimes composed entirely of *popolari*, and sometimes of nobles and *popolari* together. Meanwhile hostilities were resumed between the Genoese and the Venetians, who felt that their trade was threatened by the acquisition of Chios (1346) by the Genoese; and they secured an ally in the King of Aragon—that is, in the Catalan navy. At first the Genoese were victorious, but then, at Loiera, near Alghero in Sardinia, the allied fleets, under Nicolo Pisani, utterly defeated the Genoese fleet, commanded by a Grimaldi. Genoa then gave itself *in signoria* to Giovanni, Archbishop of Milan (1353).

It was now the turn of Milan to contend with Venice; and the war spread to the mainland, where the Este, the Carraresi, the Gonzaga, and finally the Scaligeri (1354) allied themselves with Venice against the Visconti. At the beginning of hostilities the archbishop died (October 1354). His nephews (the sons of a brother who had predeceased him), Matteo II, Bernabò and Galeazzo II, whom Giovanni had caused to be elected as his successors, divided the State among themselves, holding Milan and Genoa in common. At this juncture Charles IV (§ 59) entered Italy, and assumed the royal crown in Sant' Ambrogio, Milan (January 1355). The anti-Viscontean league had vainly endeavoured to obtain the support of the Emperor; but so far from joining the league, he conferred the vicariate on the Visconti, in return for the usual payment. Meanwhile the Genoese had defeated the Venetian fleet at Portolongo in the Aegean (November 1354). A truce was concluded between the league and the Visconti, which in June 1355 was transformed into a peace between Venice and Milan-Genoa. By the terms of this peace it was stipulated that the Adriatic should remain closed to Genoese vessels, and the Mediterranean between Porto Pisano and Marseilles to Venetian ships. But in the following year there was fighting in Genoa between the Visconteans and the anti-Visconteans. (Nobles and people were intermingled in both these factions.) Simone Boccanegra, at the head of a group of *popolari*, won a victory for the anti-Visconteans, and was once more proclaimed Doge. He excluded the nobles from office, and under his successors the government continued to be popular, although

there were quarrels and open conflicts between the various factions of the people. But in 1378, under the *dogato* of Nicolò di Guarco, the nobles were once more admitted to half the offices in the State.

Venice also, after the conspiracy of Baiamonte Tiepolo, which aimed at overthrowing the aristocratic government (§ 57), was shaken by another internal disturbance, but this, so far from overthrowing the government, actually resulted in its further consolidation. An important step in this direction was the final institution of the "Council of the Ten" (§ 57) as the constitutive organ of the government (1335). There was a last reaction against the government—the conspiracy of the Doge Marino Faliero, who, actuated partly by personal feeling, conspired with representatives of the people to re-establish the personal power of the Doge (which had been so greatly reduced by the oligarchy then in process of formation); when the *dogato* would doubtless have been of the same type as the adjacent *signorie* of the mainland. The conspiracy was discovered and repressed by the efforts of the Ten, and Faliero was put to death (April 1355).

Venice, having by the acquisition of Treviso obtained a firm foothold on the Italian mainland, now found herself obliged to defend her maritime possessions in Dalmatia against the King of Hungary, Louis I of Anjou. Zara, rebelling against Venice, surrendered itself to Louis; but at the time the king was powerless to prevent the republic from subduing the rebellious city (1346). The rebellion of Capodistria, on the adjacent Istrian coast, was of even briefer duration (1348). But after the peace of 1355 (with the Visconti: see above) Venice found herself involved in immediate war with the King of Hungary, who straightway invaded the Trevisan March, not without assistance from Francesco da Carrara. Treviso resisted the invader, but he succeeded in taking possession of Mestre, the bridgehead by which Venice held communication with the mainland. In Dalmatia Traù and Spalato rebelled against the republic. By the terms of the peace of 1358 Venice had to abandon the Dalmatian cities.

During the truce between the Visconti and the Lombard coalition Charles IV had advanced into Tuscany, where the Florentine league dissolved at his approach. Siena, like Volterra, and even San Miniato, which was close to Florence, surrendered herself to the Emperor,

who also obtained the *signoria* of Pisa, after dispossessing the Gambacorta. Florence herself took the oath of submission to the Emperor—a thing which she had done neither for Henry VII nor for Louis the Bavarian—obtaining the confirmation of all her institutions, while neither the Emperor nor any vicar of his was to enter the city. On the other hand, the priors and the *gonfaloniere* of the people were appointed vicars *in perpetuo*. In return the Emperor received large sums of money.

Charles IV's *signorie* in Tuscany came to an end even before he left the country for Upper Italy (June 1355) on his return from Rome, where he had been crowned (April 1355). In Siena the *popolo minuto* won the victory, excluding the nobility. In Pisa the government was now in the hands of the *popolo minuto* and the older nobility, the Gambacorta being excluded. Relations between Florence and Pisa were beginning to deteriorate. Florence wished to acquire her own outlet to the sea. She obtained from the Sienese Talamone in the Tuscan Maremma, and prohibited all commerce with Pisa: a step which was followed by war (1356). The Florentines succeeded in operating the port of Talamone, and the war dragged on for years, to the serious detriment of the two countrysides, which were subjected to constant depredation and incendiarism. More than ever the two belligerents made use of the foreign Companies; the Pisans enlisted Baumgarten and Hawkwood, but the Florentines managed to deprive them of the former by buying his services for themselves. In the end the Pisan banker Giovanni d'Agnello, by agreement with Hawkwood, seized the government of Pisa by a *coup de main*, was acclaimed Doge by the people, and concluded a peace with Florence which was wholly to the latter's advantage (1364). At the same time the Florentines consolidated their dominion over the nobles and the lesser communes of the Val d'Arno, and especially of Casentino, extending their rule still further by the acquisition of Volterra (1361).

During these years Florence continued to hold aloof from the war in Lombardy, which had broken out again in 1356. Matteo II was dead; in the new partition Galeazzo II took the western part of the dominion and Bernabò the eastern; and now even Milan was divided. The anti-Viscontean league was reinforced by Giovanni Visconti of Oleggio, who, being appointed vicar in Bologna by the Visconti, held

the city on his own account; by Giovanni II, Marquis of Monferrato (1338-1372); and by Charles IV himself, the Visconti having shut the gates of Milan in his face. Giovanni di Monferrato was appointed vicar of Lombardy by the Emperor, and with the assistance of Pavia, which had likewise taken up arms against the Visconti, he captured Asti and their other Piedmontese possessions. Pavia was besieged by the Viscontean forces, but the citizens, inspired by the sermons of the young Augustinian friar Jacopo Bussolari, organized resistance, and making a sortie destroyed the works of the besiegers, whom they put to flight. In Lombardy also the league was victorious, and here it hired the services of Count Lando (§ 62). Novara was captured by the Marquis of Monferrato; and finally Genoa itself (November 1356) cast off the rule of the Visconti. But in the same month the federal army—poorer by the defection of the Marquis Giovanni, who refused to serve under Count Lando—was defeated between Milan and Pavia. In two successive years the league had won the more important pitched battles; nevertheless, the Visconti were still stronger, and through the mediation of Venice the Peace of Milan was concluded in June 1358; a peace which practically re-established the *statu quo*. Pavia, not mentioned in the treaty, was afterwards (1359) taken by Galeazzo II; and here hostilities were recommenced by the Marquis of Monferrato, who enrolled the barbarous horde of the English "White Company," and also obtained support from Genoa. Bernabò, on the other hand, vainly attempted to recover Bologna, which had been ceded to the Pope by Oleggio, at the instance of the Papal Legate Albornoz (§ 65). And now Upper Italy was devastated by a terrible pestilence (1361-1362), following the no less disastrous pestilence of 1348, which Boccaccio has rendered famous by his introduction to the *Decamerone* (§ 63).

§ 65. THE ADVENTURE OF COLA DI RIENZO AND THE TEMPORAL RECONSTRUCTION OF THE PAPAL DOMINION.—With Albornoz the Papal power returned to the political stage, after twenty years of eclipse. Now, for the next thirty years, it attempted not only to recover and consolidate its dominion over the Papal territories, but also to extend them, and to make its influence felt throughout Italy.

The departure of Cardinal Del Poggetto (§ 60) had enabled the signorial and communal regimes to develop unhindered in these territories. In Romagna the *signorie* already established in the 13th century were still in power: the Manfredi in Faenza, the Ordelaffi in Forlè, the da Polenta in Ravenna, the Malatesta in Rimini, and later on in Pesaro and Fano also. In Urbino and Montefeltro the Montefeltro still ruled; and in Count Federico's time they extended their dominion for a period (about 1320) into the March of Ancona, to Gagli and Recanati, and even to Spoleto and Assisi. In the Marches the Varano, lords of Camerino, were becoming more powerful. In contending with the Montefeltro they were supported by the Pope, who conferred the vicariate upon them in respect of their directly governed dominions, and also the more general title of Marquises of Ancona.

In Umbria—or the Duchy of Spoleto, as it was then called, although there were no longer any dukes there, but merely pontifical rectors—the communal system still prevailed. The largest commune in these regions was Perugia, situated between the duchy and Tuscany. Ruled by the *borghesia grassa*, or *Raspauli*, it was no stranger to the usual conflicts between the *popolo grasso* and the nobles and the *popolo minuto*. Perugia was Guelf, and we have already noted the nature of its relations with Florence. About the middle of the century it had greatly extended its dominion in all directions, making war in the south upon Foligno and Spoleto, and aiming at the subjection of Assisi, while in the north it contended with Arezzo, and above all with Siena, for predominance in Città di Castello, Cortona, and Montepulciano.

The most turbulent commune was that of Rome. The nobles quarrelled with the *popolari*, and were also divided among themselves; more especially into the factions of the Guelf Orsini and the Ghibelline Colonna. There were alternations and combinations of the most varied forms of government; the two citizen senators, the foreign senator (a sort of *podestà*)—both elected, as a rule, by the Pope, but sometimes by the people—the captains of the wards, and the captain of the people. And the city felt the repercussions of the general conflicts between the Italian Guelfs and Ghibellines, between the Papacy and the Empire. We have seen that in the time of Louis the Bavarian the

popular Ghibelline government was in power, and that on its fall Robert of Anjou was restored to the office of senator. Notwithstanding such changes, the quarrels of the Orsini and the Colonna continued to disturb the city, which, deprived of its main source of wealth by the remoteness of the Papal court, fell into the greatest squalor, and the population declined to no more than 30,000. It is said that sheep used to graze in St. Peter's and the Lateran.

In 1337 the people conferred the *signoria* upon Benedict XII, electing him senator for life, captain, and defender of the republic. It was hoped that the pontiff might thereby be induced to return, but this hope was disappointed. The pontiff elected the usual pair of senators to exercise the effective government of the city. But in 1339 a popular rising overthrew the two senators, and instituted, after the example of Florence—and Florence was actually consulted—thirteen heads of the *arti*, with a *gonfaloniere* and captain of the people. However, when the Pope annulled the new ordinances the people submitted. In 1342, shortly before the death of King Robert, a fresh revolution restored the popular government of the thirteen *buoni uomini*; and this time Pope Clement VI sanctioned the change, receiving at the same time the confirmation of his overlordship.

On this occasion an ambassador was sent to the Pope who gained his favour: Cola di Rienzo, a *popolano*, the son of a tavern-keeper, who had adopted the profession of notary, and whom the pontiff now appointed notary to the financial administration of the city—or the Camera, as it was called. He was a man of natural ability and some classical learning, who was filled with enthusiasm for the traditions of ancient Rome and the Roman Empire—which he imagined as a free and popular government—and to a certain extent he succeeded in making the people share his enthusiasm. He hated the nobles, who had killed one of his brothers. On returning from Avignon he became a popular hero—thanks in some degree to his public office—and he devised a conspiracy, most of the conspirators being members of the prosperous middle class. On Whit-Sunday (20 May) 1347 he convoked in Campodoglio the *parlamento* of the people, which set up a new democratic government, while Stefano Colonna and the other barons were expelled from the city. The Papal vicar in Rome approved of the revolu-

tion; and in a second assembly Cola assumed the title of Tribune of the Roman Republic "by the authority of Our Lord Jesus Christ." This government, which was at one and the same time classical, popular, and theocratic, was to be the beginning of the regeneration of Italy, and indeed of the whole world; for which reason Cola sent messengers to the Pope, the king, the princes, and the cities, inviting the Italian cities to enter into "a sacred union" with Rome. This proposal was favourably received, especially by Florence, Siena and Perugia, where endeavours were made to support him; and some little time afterwards he went so far as to cite the Pope and the Emperor to appear before him as the representative of the Roman people. His plans, fantastic though they were, inspired many persons (and among them Petrarch) with the greatest enthusiasm. They were in accord with the vague aspirations of the age, but there was not the remotest possibility of their realization.

The Roman nobles had made their submission to the new government; but before long, returning to their strongholds in the Campagna, they took up arms against it. In an encounter before the walls of Rome (November 1347) Cola defeated the baronial army, and Stefano Colonna himself was left dead on the field. But Cola, instead of profiting by his victory and pursuing his enemies into the Campagna, disbanded his army. The city, which was thus almost in a state of siege, began to suffer from famine, while Cola, in order to obtain money, found himself compelled to impose duties and special war taxes on the people. The Papal Legate, Cardinal Bertrand de Deux, in league with the nobles, threatened him with excommunication and with trial on a charge of heresy. Cola made submission to the pontifical authority and annulled all his usurpations of imperial power. The Pope issued a Bull of excommunication, but before this could arrive in Rome a conspiracy of nobles gave rise to a slight disturbance, at which Cola, indifferently supported by the people, lost his head and surrendered office (December 1347), shutting himself up in Castel Sant'Angelo. He then fled from the fortress, and from Rome, and remained for some time in the Abruzzi, in the company of hermits (§ 59), deriving from them the substance of fresh Messianic dreams. He finally made his way to the Emperor Charles IV, who sent him as a prisoner to the

Pope in Avignon. The Papal Legate, Bertrand, restored the old government of the two senators in Rome. In 1350 the Jubilee (§ 58) appeased the factions and brought fresh life to the dead city, the Pope having decreed that it should be celebrated every fiftieth instead of every hundredth year. But when the Jubilee was over the old disorders returned, and the old changes of government; in a word, anarchy.

The new Pope, Innocent VI (1352-1362), seeing that the State of the Church was threatened with complete dissolution, sent Cardinal Egidio Albornoz to Rome, with plenary powers to reorganize the State. Albornoz, a capable governor, was a grandee of Spain who had fought against the Moors before adopting the ecclesiastical career. On reaching Italy in August 1353 Albornoz proceeded first of all to northern Latium, in order to repress and subject the family of Vico, which had become extremely powerful there. The lords of Vico had for many generations held the office (which for a long while had been merely nominal) of prefect of Rome, so that they were known by the name of Prefetti di Vico. Albornoz came to an understanding with the head of a new popular government in Rome, the tribune Francesco Baroncelli; and with his assistance he succeeded in subjecting the prefect di Vico. In the retinue of Albornoz was Cola di Rienzo, who had been reconciled with the pontiff; and Albornoz, the Romans having requested that he would allow Cola once more to become the head of the government, made him senator. In this capacity Cola re-entered Rome (August 1354), and having need of money, he compelled the brothers of Fra Moriale (§ 62) to make him loans from the funds which the condottiero had accumulated by means of pillage. When Fra Moriale returned to Rome in order to recover the capital thus lent, Cola had him arrested and put to death, sequestering his wealth. This action earned him a reputation for treachery. The funds thus acquired were not sufficient—the more so as the war against the Colonna had suddenly broken out again—and Cola proceeded to impose duties and other taxes. This fact, with other arbitrary and tyrannical actions, alienated the people, who rebelled, crying: "Death to the traitor who has set up the customs!" Once again Cola lost his head; he attempted to escape from Campodoglio in disguise, but was recognized and put



to death by the mob (October 1354). Albornoz proceeded to appoint a new senator.

Albornoz decided to turn against the lords of the Romagna and the March, beginning with the Malatesta, augmenting his own forces with the petty *signori* and other men-at-arms, and with German soldiers provided by Charles IV. The Malatesta were compelled to agree to certain conditions, which were not, however, unduly disadvantageous, since in consideration of an annual tribute they were confirmed in the possession of Rimini, Pesaro, and Fano, while they made restitution of more recent conquests. Having received the submission of other territories of the March, Albornoz appointed a nephew of his own as rector. His chief enemy was now Francesco Ordelaffi, who, in addition to Forlì, was in possession of Forlimpopoli, Cesena, Castrocaro and Imola. This last held out for years, while Manfredi of Faenza surrendered everything, with the exception of Bagnocavallo, which was retained as a pontifical fief. Albornoz, who was recalled for a time to Provence, returned to Romagna, and in 1359 he at last obtained the submission of Ordelaffi, who for the time being retained only Forlimpopoli and Castrocaro. The Montefeltro were reduced to the possession of Urbino and Cagli in the capacity of pontifical vicars. We have already seen that Albornoz had succeeded in securing Bologna for the Holy See (§ 64). Lastly he turned against Perugia, depriving it of Assisi, Gualdo, and other possessions, and compelling its submission.

The work of reconstructing the Papal dominion as undertaken by Albornoz was effected, on the whole, along the following lines: the local *signorie* were eliminated or reduced to a minimum, while the cities were as far as possible restored to the direct government of the Holy See. At the same time, in order to safeguard the Papal government, he established their governors in the fortresses overlooking the cities, and he himself constructed several of these fortresses. To crown this work of reorganization he promulgated a series of excellent laws, which were to override any local statutes: the so-called *Costituzioni egidiane*, some of which remained in force until the 19th century.

Where the cardinal had less influence was in Rome. There, after

the final downfall of Rienzo, the people continued to gain power, while the old nobility was eliminated from the government of the city; and the fact that the cardinal was making war upon them in the provinces contributed to their disappearance. The Pope now proceeded, once in every six months, to appoint a foreign senator, who thus held a position comparable to that of the *podestà* of the 13th century. Apart from this senator the people appointed, from 1358 onwards, a college of seven "reformers of the republic," who were the real governors of the commune, holding a position like that of the Priors of Florence. The magistrature was recruited almost entirely from the petty nobility and the *popolari*, a body of militia was recruited from the people, armed with crossbows and divided on the basis of the wards, under the supreme command of two *banderesi*. This force was intended to assure public order and the execution of judicial sentences, and also to repress the barons. In Latium, however, the nobles offered resistance. The commune of Rome—like the other great communes—endeavoured for centuries to subject the surrounding countryside—that is, the Campagna; but with very indifferent success. Apart from the *signori*, and the intervention of the Papal authority, more than one city held out against it: for example, Viterbo in the north and Velletri in the south. After some years of war Rome made peace with Velletri on the intervention of Alborno, who resigned himself to confirming the new democratic constitution of the Roman commune.

§ 66. THE POPES, THE VISCONTI, AND FLORENCE. THE RETURN OF THE PAPACY AND THE GREAT SCHISM.—With the re-acquisition of Bologna the Papal policy entered into direct competition with that of the Visconti. Against Bernabò, who treated the pontifical Curia with extreme arrogance, and imposed oppressive taxes on the clergy, Alborno revived a league between Nicolò, Marquis of Ferrara, Feltrino da Gonzaga, lord of Reggio, Francesco da Carrara, lord of Padua, and the Scaliger, Cansignore (1362). As usual, the confederates enjoyed a certain military preponderance, the more so as in the west the Marquis of Monferrato repulsed Galeazzo, advancing victoriously into the Milanese. This, however, was not enough to shake the solid structure of the Viscontean dominion, and the peace,

concluded through the mediation of the kings of France and Hungary and the Emperor (1364), cost Bernabò no more than the final surrender of Bologna, in return for a very large indemnity (half a million florins), while Galeazzo retained Pavia, Alba and Novara, the Marquis of Monferrato taking Asti.

Italy being thus pacified, and the reconstruction of the Papal State accomplished, Urban V (1362–1370), the successor of Innocent VI, began to consider the question of restoring the Holy See to Rome. The Italians eagerly besought him to do so, and they had an eloquent spokesman in Petrarch (§ 63), who inquired of the Pope: what account would he have to render of his actions if Christ should ask him why he had preferred Avignon to Rome, and if Peter should remind him that he had gone to Rome although he knew that he must meet his death there (the legend of “Quo vadis”). In May 1367 Urban V proceeded to Genoa, and thence by sea to the Papal State, where he took up his residence in Viterbo. There Albornoz was able to tender him the homage of all the estates of the Papal dominions, but in August he died; a grievous loss for the pontiff. However, in October the Pope re-entered Rome, to the jubilation of the people, and indeed of all Italy. The great benefits to the peninsula foretold by Petrarch and by many others did not materialize; nevertheless, the Roman commune enjoyed some years of peaceful and orderly existence. Urban V abolished the College of Seven and the *Banderesi* (though he did not suppress the communal militia), and gave the “foreign” senator the assistance of a smaller college or council of three “Conservators of the Urban Camera,” who exercised functions analogous to those of the Seven, while the “executors of Justice” replaced the *Banderesi*. However, the thirteen chiefs of the wards and the consuls of the corporations continued to sit on the city councils.

On the other hand, the war in Upper Italy was resumed, Urban V having formed, in August 1367, a new anti-Viscontean league, which at all events comprised a formidable number of confederates: Pope and Emperor, the Savoyards, the Este, the Gonzaga, the Carrara, and Louis, King of Hungary. The Visconti allied themselves with the Scaligeri and enrolled the English “White Company” of John Hawkwood (Giovanni Acuto: § 62).

The war began in 1368, and Charles IV took part in it, descending into Italy with a great army, while the Pope once more excommunicated the Visconti and called upon all Christendom to take up arms against them. The Emperor, moving in the direction of Rome, turned back to intervene in the affairs of Central Italy, but with no more lasting effect than on the former occasion. This was the end of the *dogato* of Giovanni d'Agnello in Pisa, where Charles appointed a vicar imperial; but in reality the power of government was once more exercised by the *popolo grasso*. Siena, in which Charles had established another vicariate, rebelled against him on his return from Rome, and it was fortunate for him that the city allowed him to proceed (January 1369). In Pisa the *signoria* was given to Piero Gambacorta; Lucca, which the Doge Agnello had previously surrendered to the Emperor, was declared to be immediately subject to the Empire in return for a large money payment.

Meanwhile, in the civic government of Florence the *popolo grasso* had become more and more powerful, exercising their authority through captains of the Guelf party, who were lavish of their accusations of Ghibellinism (at the expense, for the most part, of the *popolo minuto*), making it impossible for the accused—or the *ammoniti* (admonished), as they were called—to hold office in the commune. The institution of “admonition,” being thus misused, degenerated into a means of obtaining money. Through this abuse of undiluted Guelfism a dominant oligarchy was formed, at the head of which were the Albizzi; but they had a competitor, supported by the *popolo minuto*, in the faction of the Ricci.

Even in the anti-Viscontean war the Emperor achieved nothing of importance, and he very soon concluded a truce, which was followed (February 1369) by a general peace. But when Bernabò extended his political and military activities into Tuscany and Umbria, at the expense of Florence and the pontiff, a league was once more formed against him, between these two powers, the kingdom of Naples, Pisa, Lucca and Bologna, the Este, the Gonzaga, and the Carrara. Bernabò successfully opposed the league, and very soon (November 1370) a fresh peace was concluded. However, this was shortly afterwards followed by a resumption of hostilities, in which Amedeo VI of

Savoy, appointed vicar imperial in Lombardy (§ 67), fought against Galeazzo in the west, taking the place of Giovanni di Monferrato, who died in March 1372.

Thus Central and Southern Italy, and a good part of Northern Italy, were united against the menace of Viscontean hegemony. Yet this great coalition failed to inflict any lasting injury on the enemy. Despite a few local risings, the Visconti continued in possession of the bulk of their dominions. The political life of the subjected cities being henceforth extinguished (for such political activity as still persisted was more than anything the factious opposition of the nobles or of individuals), the Visconti installed a system of governmental centralization and police control, which, what with arbitrary commands and ferocious repressions (and the notorious inquest or *quaresima* of Galeazzo II, who prolonged the torture of State offenders for 41 days), ensured the obedience of the citizens by means of terrorism. At the same time, the government administered equal justice as between the classes, maintaining internal peace and order, and favouring the economic life of the cities, so that it was able to obtain ample resources for the upkeep of its military forces and the resplendent establishments of the princes. The subjection of the urban populations degenerated into a stagnant passivity which depressed and corrupted the standards of social life; but this passivity satisfied the overbearing Visconti. As for the coalition, it was lacking in homogeneity, unity of aim, and energy; and only in Florence was there any manifestation of political and moral superiority. Apart from the temporary and nominal accession of the kingdom of Naples, the two principal powers of the coalition were Florence and the Pope. Florence, inspired by a sincere republican hatred of the Viscontean tyranny, and intensely anxious to preserve, not merely her preponderance in Tuscany, but also her very independence, had to protect herself not only against the hostile Visconti, but also against her pontifical allies.

In September 1370 Urban V, yielding to the pressure of the French cardinals, and actuated also by other motives, set out on the return journey to Avignon, where he died in December. Another Frenchman was immediately elected as his successor: Gregory XI (1370-1378). Now more than ever the pontiff was preoccupied with

the problem of temporal power, as the necessary condition of the return to Rome, which he also desired, and which the Italians continued to advise.

And now this desire found an interpreter in the Sienese *popolana* Caterina Benincasa—known to history as St. Catherine of Siena (1347–1380)—who by her reputation for sanctity, her eminent piety, and the alleged possession of extraordinary gifts, exercised a remarkable influence over her contemporaries, and was persuaded to concern herself with the political affairs of the day.

The Church received a further accession of temporal power when in 1371 the insurrection of the *popolo minuto* of Perugia against the Raspanti persuaded the city to surrender itself to the pontiff. The Papal Legate established in Perugia, where he set up a tyrannical government, conspired with his colleague in Bologna, with a view to extending the Papal rule in Tuscany, at the expense of Siena, Arezzo and Florence. At this all Tuscany—Florence, Siena, Arezzo, Lucca, Pisa—together with Bernabò Visconti and Queen Giovanna (Joanna) of Naples, entered into a league to check this ecclesiastical thirst for temporal dominion, fomenting rebellion in the Papal State. The sound administration organized by Albornoz had soon degenerated; the pontifical governors ruled like tyrants, whose chief concern was the extortion of money. The revolt was general; in some parts the *signori* re-established their old dominion; in others the cities—more especially Perugia and Bologna—regained their communal liberties (1375–1376).

Gregory XI turned against the Florentines, as the instigators of the league and the rebellion—and moreover, they had confiscated ecclesiastical property—excommunicating them, laying upon them the Papal interdict, and exhorting all friends of the Church to confiscate their goods and reduce them to slavery. Further, he sent Cardinal Roberto dei conti di Ginevra, a man of evil reputation, to make war upon them with an army of Breton mercenaries, and with this savage horde the cardinal began hostilities in the Bolognese (1376). The Florentines made preparations for a strenuous resistance, in which both Albizzi and Ricci participated, and they appointed a special magistrature, the “Otto della guerra,” known by the people as “the holy Eight.”

For the second and last time the Pope returned to Italy. In January 1377 Gregory XI made his entry into Rome. He maintained peaceful relations with the city, leaving it in possession of its republican government; he came to terms with the Prefetto di Vico, who had re-established his power, confirming him in part of his possessions; and he also entered into an agreement with Bologna, by which the city accepted a pontifical vicar and retained its own institutions. Cesena, rebelling against the Bretons, was subdued by Cardinal Robert; the hideous massacre of the citizens, accompanied by rape and spoliation, filled Italy with horror and indignation. Some of the Visconti—and firstly Galeazzo—made peace with the pontiff, so that even Bernabò was inclined to accept reconciliation, assuming, at the Pope's request, the part of mediator in respect of the Florentines. The latter had stubbornly continued the war, and had succeeded in persuading Hawkwood to turn his coat, and leave the service of the Pope for their own. They contrived that the clergy should bear the greater part of the cost of the war, and they adjured the priests to ignore the interdict. Saint Catherine had intervened in vain, reproving the Florentines for their obduracy, and exhorting the Pope, with ingenuous candour, to beware of excessive concern for his temporal interests. In the end the Florentines, together with their Tuscan allies, having lost the support of their other confederates, agreed to negotiate in a congress which assembled in Sarzana. It was attended by Bernabò in person, and by the ambassadors of Queen Giovanna, of Genoa, of Venice, and of the King of France; but Gregory XI died (March 1378) before it had arrived at any conclusion.

The Conclave assembled in Rome on the 7 April 1378. Of the sixteen cardinals present only four were Italian. The people of Rome, fearing lest the seat of the Papacy might again be transferred, rioted, shouting: "We want a Roman, or at least an Italian!" On the following day the cardinals elected the Archbishop of Bari, Bartolomeo Prignano, an Italian, though a subject of the French Angevins; the last Pope who was never a cardinal. He took the name of Urban VI. By some misunderstanding it was at first believed in the city that the Roman Cardinal Tebaldeschi had been elected; but when the truth was known the Pope was enthroned without opposition. The election

had taken place under a certain degree of pressure from the riotous populace, but it had nevertheless been perfectly regular in form, and the choice had been unanimous. Moreover, the cardinals all attended the enthronement and coronation of the Pope, and took part in his consistories, thereby showing that they regarded him as the lawful pontiff. Nevertheless, not long afterwards, exasperated by the new Pope's excessive zeal for reform, and by his harsh and imperious government, the eleven French cardinals, together with one Spanish cardinal, assembled at Anagni, and declared (August) that Pope Urban was a usurper, since he was elected under the duress of force, and was excommunicate. Thereupon, proceeding to Fondi with three Italian cardinals, they elected Roberto di Ginevra, the man responsible for the massacre of Cesena, who took the name of Clement VII (20 September). The Breton mercenaries of the French Pope having been routed near Marino (April 1379) by the Italo-German Company of St. George, under the command of Alberico da Barbiano, Clement VII embarked at Naples, where he had taken refuge with Queen Giovanna, his partisan, and sailed for France (June 1379), where he re-established the Holy See in Avignon. And so there were once more Popes in Avignon—Clement VII (1378–1394) and Benedict XIII (the Spaniard Pietro de Luna, 1394–1423)—while in Rome Urban VI (1378–1389) was followed by Boniface IX (1389–1404), Innocent VII (1404–1406), and Gregory XII (1406–1415).

The conditions under which Urban VI had been elected were not well understood by his contemporaries, so that it was natural that many of them should actually believe that Urban was not the lawful pontiff. Christendom was therefore divided into two camps, one upholding the Roman Pope and one the Pope of Avignon, and the Western Schism came into being (1378–1415). Regarding the recognition of one or the other Pope, political motives were, of course, not without influence. The kingdom of Naples, France, Spain, Scotland, Savoy, and some of the German states recognized Clement VII; the Empire and the rest of Europe acknowledged Urban. The two Popes excommunicated each other, together with their respective followers, so that the whole of Christendom was excommunicate. The result was incredible confusion in the minds of the faithful, an increase of insubor-



dination among the clergy, an aggravation of the bad moral conditions of the latter, and a diminished respect for the Papacy; moreover, the Christian world, having to make provision for two pontifical Curie at the same time, was more than ever exasperated by the curial taxes, and the two heads of the Church endeavoured to make money by the creation of benefices, which were given by each of them to different persons. The principal result of the Great Schism as regards the history of Italy was that it interrupted for half a century the progressive formation of the Papal principality, and put an end to any possibility of Papal hegemony in Italy. The war between the Pope and Florence soon came to an end, for Urban VI hastened to renounce most of the financial claims of his predecessor. There was also a long intermission in the war between the Visconti and the anti-Visconteans in Central and Northern Italy.

§ 67. INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENTS OF THE VARIOUS ITALIAN STATES.—Gian Galeazzo, known as the Count of Virtue (from his fief of Vertus in Champagne), who succeeded to his father Galeazzo II in 1378, obtained the vicariate of Lombardy from the Emperor Wenceslas, to the great discontent of his uncle Bernabò. Gian Galeazzo behaved with moderation; he abolished or mitigated penalties, reduced taxation, respected the clergy, eliminated the captains set over the small cities if they tyrannized over them, and exercised a strict supervision over all public officials. Such a government as his naturally attracted the attention of the subjects of Bernabò, who of recent years had grown crueller and crueller, and apparently had thoughts of ridding himself of his nephew. Galeazzo, however, foresaw this; and on encountering him in Milan he took him and his sons prisoners by surprise (May 1385). The Council General of the commune of Milan ratified this act of violence, proclaiming the “Conte di Virtù” their sole lord. In December of the same year Bernabò died in prison, perhaps by poison.

We have seen that Monferrato and Savoy took part in the Lombard war. The House of Savoy, which was divided in the 14th century into the principal branch of the Counts of Savoy, and the younger branch, vassal to the former, of the princes of Achaia—who held the greater

part of the Cisalpine territories, and among them Turin—succeeded, after the death of Robert of Anjou, in taking possession of a portion of the Angevin territories in Piedmont, including Cuneo. Increasing in power, it became a rival of the Marquises of Monferrato, who, however, during the lifetime of Giovanni II (1338–1372), of whom frequent mention has already been made, still retained the predominance. Between Giovanni II and the Count of Savoy, Amedeo VI (1334–1383)—known as the Green Count, from the habitual colour of his garments—an agreement was concluded in 1349 for the indivisible condominium of Ivrea. But this did not put an end to their rivalry, and the Green Count concluded a short-lived league with Galeazzo II Visconti against Monferrato, by which he obtained a little territory in the Canavese. Such a policy, however, was unnatural, for it risked increasing the preponderance of the powerful Visconti in Piedmont; so that on the death of Giovanni II the Green Count took the part of his heirs, joining (§ 66) the anti-Viscontean coalition. In this war he gained some territory, above all at the expense of the Marquis of Saluzzo, an ally of the Visconti.

Like his grandfather Amedeo V, who went to fight against the Turks at Rhodes at the side of the knights of Jerusalem (whence the legend that the motto “Fert” on the collar of the highest order of knighthood of the House of Savoy, that of the Holy Annunciation, signifies “Fortitudo ejus Rhodum tenuit”), the Green Count undertook an expedition to the East (1366–1367) against the Turks and Bulgars, in aid of his cousin John V Palaeologus, perhaps with the idea of asserting his rights to the Empire as against those of the Palaeologi of Monferrato (§ 56). The expedition was merely a successful adventure, without any permanent result as regards the situation in the East or the power of the House of Savoy; nevertheless, it enhanced the Count’s prestige. In 1383 Amedeo VI died, and was succeeded by his son Amedeo VII, the “Red Count” (1383–1391), who increased his possessions by the acquisition of Nice, with its county, the citizens of Nice having made submission to him in order to escape the rule of Louis I of the second House of Anjou (see below).

In 1378 war broke out again between Venice and Genoa, and at one moment the Venetian Republic seemed to be on the verge of

disaster. The cause of the war was the customary rivalry in the East. Venice had become predominant in Cyprus, and the island of Tenedos, at the mouth of the Dardanelles, which was coveted by the Genoese, had fallen into the hands of the Venetians, thanks to their influence in Constantinople. Genoa found allies in the Carrarese, the King of Hungary, and the Patriarch of Aquileia. The Venetians could count only on the somewhat passive benevolence of the King of Cyprus, and on Bernabò Visconti and the King of Aragon. The war was fought both in Italian and Mediterranean waters. The Genoese were defeated by the Venetian admiral Vittor Pisani at Porto d'Anzio (1378). The Venetian fleet then captured Cattaro and other Dalmatian seaports. But in 1379 the Genoese surprised Pisani at Pola, where his fleet was undergoing repairs. They captured the Venetian vessels, and Pisani, who succeeded in escaping, was thrown into prison in Venice. The Genoese then took Chioggia, cutting communications between Venice and Lombardy, and established themselves at Malamocco, so that the very heart of Venice was threatened. On the top of this a Hungarian-Paduan army laid siege to Treviso, which, however, resisted the besiegers. The Venetians did not therefore lose heart. They recalled Carlo Zeno from the East, where his squadron was threatening Pera; and in the Venetian lagoon they equipped a new fleet, the cost being borne by private citizens, who in return were promoted to the nobility. The command was given to Vittor Pisani, who was released from prison; and the Genoese were defeated and blockaded in Chioggia (1379). The reduced fleet of Carlo Zeno unexpectedly arrived to reinforce the besiegers; various Genoese expeditions failed to break the blockade, and Chioggia at last capitulated (June 1380). Now it was the turn of the Venetian fleet, under the command of Zeno—for Pisani had died in the meantime—to appear off Genoa (July 1381). But Treviso was still closely blockaded by Francesco da Carrara, and the Venetians could find nothing better to do than to cede it to Leopold Duke of Austria. Through the mediation of Amedeo VI of Savoy the Peace of Turin was concluded in August 1381. Tenedos was abandoned and rendered uninhabitable; Venice renounced the protectorate over Cyprus, and it was stipulated that the old navigation treaties between Genoa and Venice should be

re-established, the Greek Emperor being included in the peace. Venice undertook to pay Hungary a sum of money, and in return she secured certain restrictions on Hungarian trade and navigation. With the Patriarch of Aquileia it was agreed that Trieste, which had submitted itself to him, should be restored to liberty by Venice, retaining certain Venetian privileges. But that same year the city submitted itself to the Duke of Austria. With Padua the *statu quo* was established, the trade in salt to be carried on as before. The Carrarese now made war upon the Duke of Austria for Treviso, and the Duke finally ceded the city in return for a money payment (1384). In Venice the aristocratic government continued to consolidate its power, while that of the Doge diminished. As for the popular assembly, it had lost all significance; it no longer took part in the election of officials, and it was very rarely convoked.

In Genoa, on the other hand, there was in 1383 a conflict between the Doge Guarco and the special magistrature which administered the finances, and now sought to restrict the power of the Doge. The people seized this opportunity of protesting against the consumption-duties. The popular forces triumphed; but they were themselves divided into *popolo grasso* and *popolo minuto*, the leader of the latter being Antoniotto Adorno, who had already competed with Guarco for the *dogato*. The *popolo grasso* succeeded in electing Leonardo da Montaldo, and even Adorno's faction agreed to acknowledge him as doge. A general amnesty was declared; 15 councillors were appointed, all *popolari*, the duties on wine and meat were reduced, and others were abolished. During the *dogato* of Leonardo the King of Cyprus, James of Lusignan, ceded Famagusta to the Genoese. Leonardo died of the plague in June 1384, and was peacefully succeeded by Adorno, who governed as justly as his predecessor, so that the city enjoyed some years of tranquillity.

During these years there were political and social commotions of great importance in Florence. Even before peace was concluded with Urban VI there was an embittered clash of parties, the Eight and the Medici supporting the Ricci. The Albizzi were endeavouring to make themselves the absolute masters of the city, but they encountered a resolute adversary in Salvestro de' Medici, who had been elected

gonfalonier of the people. In June and July 1378 the *popolo minuto* rose in violent rebellion against the *popolo grasso* and the government, demanding measures for the benefit of exiles and debtors, and the constitution of special guilds for the workers, who had hitherto been subject to the already existing *arti*. For example, the wool-combers, the carders, and the dyers were unwilling to continue in a state of subjection to the *arte della lana*, but wished to organize themselves separately, with their own officers and their own regulations. They were especially prominent in the insurrection of the wool-carders, known as the *ciompi*. The *plebs* finally took possession of the Palazzo della Signoria, when they acclaimed a *ciompo*, Michele di Lando, as *gonfaloniere* and *signore*. Landi proposed to constitute a *signoria* consisting of equal numbers of *popolo grasso*, *mediano*, and *minuto*, and he attempted to form a party of his own. The mob, considering that they were not sufficiently favoured, began to riot, and he defeated them by armed force. The result was that the *popolo minuto* lost heart, the new *arti* were dissolved, and Michele himself was swept away. The party of the Ricci enjoyed a brief supremacy, but the *popolo grasso*, the leaders of the Guelf party, and the Albizzi came into power again.

During these years the kingdom of Naples made another brief appearance in the political arena. After the death of Robert of Anjou (§ 60) the decadence which had declared itself in his lifetime became still more pronounced. The barons continued to increase their power at the expense of the royal authority, and the various branches of the Angevin family—the Angevins of Hungary, Taranto, Durazzo—encouraged the formation of factions which rent the kingdom asunder. The heir to the throne, the young daughter of the late Duke of Calabria, Giovanna I (1343–1381), was advised by a “council of tutelage.” Her grandfather had given her in marriage to Andrea, the brother of Louis I, the Angevin King of Hungary, with the object of consolidating her position; but actually the marriage had a contrary effect, since Andrea aspired to wear the crown and govern the kingdom. The dissension between husband and wife was aggravated by Andrea’s uncouthness as compared with Giovanna’s tendency to luxury, pomp, and licence. Two factions were formed, the Hungarian and the Nea-

politan, but following upon the adhesion of two branches of the Angevin family they were known as the Durazzeschi and the Tarantini. The Pope, having intervened as suzerain of the kingdom, declared himself in favour of Andrea's coronation, and to this Giovanna consented; but before he could assume the crown Andrea was murdered in Aversa (September 1345) by conspirators, probably with the complicity of Giovanna.

The young queen now looked to the Angevins of Taranto for support, and in August 1347 she married one of the family: Louis, to whom she gave the title and authority of king, whereupon civil war broke out in the kingdom between the Tarantini and the Durazzeschi. Louis of Hungary then claimed the crown for Andrea's posthumous son, under his own tutelage. Openly accusing Giovanna of complicity in her husband's murder he entered Italy and invaded the kingdom (end of 1347). Giovanna and Louis of Taranto fled to Provence; but the Durazzeschi were persecuted by Louis I, who sent Andrea's posthumous son to Hungary, where he died soon afterwards. Louis took possession of the whole kingdom, and returned to Hungary, leaving a lieutenant in Naples (1348).

In the meantime Giovanna had been declared innocent by the Pope. Ceding Avignon to the Pope, in order to obtain money, she returned to Naples with her husband (1348). The war dragged on for some years, ruining the kingdom; but finally Louis of Hungary consented to make peace, and Louis of Taranto was crowned king by the Papal Legate (1352). Meanwhile the barons of the realm, who had become largely independent, were devastating the kingdom by their private wars, and hostilities were resumed between the Tarantini and Durazzeschi princes. Nevertheless, Giovanna and Louis thought fit to intervene in the affairs of Sicily, where under King Louis (§ 60), and then under his brother, Frederick III (1355-1377), the factions of the Catalans, led by Velasco d'Alagona, and the Chiaramonte were at war. Many of the Sicilian *signori* went over to the side of Naples, and for some time the greater part of the island acknowledged the Angevins as its sovereigns, and in Messina (end of 1356) they received the homage of their Sicilian subjects. Before long, however, Frederick had won the upper hand, and in 1372 a peace was concluded by the

terms of which Sicily was to be ruled by the House of Aragon as the vassal of Naples and the Pope.

When Louis of Taranto died in 1362 Giovanna married Jaime of Majorca, a member of the Spanish branch of the House of Aragon. He did not bear the title of king, nor did he exercise the royal power, and he seldom appeared in Sicily. After his death Giovanna married Otto of Brunswick, under the same conditions. But all Giovanna's sons died before her; the last male representative of the Angevins of Naples was Charles of Durazzo, who lived in Hungary, in close agreement with King Louis, who was still hostile to Giovanna. When Giovanna, angered by the uncourtly manners of Urban VI, and encouraged by the King of France, acknowledged Urban's rival, Clement VII (§ 66), Urban declared her schismatic and a heretic and deprived of her kingdom; whereupon the kingdom offered itself to Louis of Hungary, who, being now an old man, put Charles of Durazzo forward in his place.

Giovanna, to protect her interests, adopted Louis I of Anjou, the brother of Charles V of France, the head of the second House of Anjou, who was invested with the kingdom by Clement VII, and began by conquering Provence. Charles of Durazzo got ahead of his rival; he was invested and crowned by Pope Urban, and he found many supporters in the kingdom. The gates of Naples were opened to him in July 1381. Queen Giovanna, after a brief resistance in Castelnuovo, surrendered. A faction having arisen within the kingdom, not without Giovanna's complicity, which favoured the French Angevin, Charles had her suffocated (May 1382). Now Louis I of Anjou appeared with a great army, which was joined by many of the barons of the kingdom; but Charles III was able to hold it in check, wearing it down by temporizing tactics, until the death of Louis in Bisceglie (1384), when Charles was left the sole ruler of the kingdom.

He was hardly free of his rival when he had a serious conflict with Urban VI. The Pope was making violent efforts to obtain greater temporal dominion for himself and his family, and especially for his nephew Francesco Buttillo, to whom Charles had assigned extensive fiefs. Urban having entered the kingdom of Naples, there was open warfare between him and Charles; the Pope, besieged in Nocera, and

then liberated, pronounced excommunication against the king, and declared that the kingdom had devolved upon the Holy See; but this did not shake Charles's position. In order to consolidate the kingdom, Charles now went to Hungary to claim the succession of Louis I (*d.* 1382); he was crowned, but was assassinated immediately afterwards. During the minority of Ladislas the kingdom of Naples was for a long while contested by Louis II of the second House of Anjou (the son of Louis I).



## CHAPTER XI

### *FINAL FORMATION AND CONFLICTS OF THE ITALIAN PRINCIPALITIES*

§ 68. THE HEGEMONY OF GIAN GALEAZZO.—Gian Galeazzo, now the sole ruler of the Viscontean State (§ 67), resolved upon a programme of aggrandizement which was more systematic than that of his predecessors. To begin with, he turned his gaze upon the Veneto, and allying himself with Francesco da Carrara (who had acquired Feltre and Belluno from the Dukes of Austria) he occupied the territory of the Scaligers (1387); after which he concluded a treaty with Venice, by the terms of which he was to divide the possessions of the Carraresi with the republic. Francesco Novello, who had succeeded to his father in Padua, the latter having resigned the government, capitulated to Visconti (1388), who kept Padua and the other cities for himself, excepting Treviso and Ceneda, which fell, by the terms of the treaty, to Venice.

Gian Galeazzo then applied himself to making conquests in Central Italy. Allying himself with the Este and the Gonzaga, he attacked Bologna and declared war upon Florence. There the oligarchy of the Albizzo had greatly consolidated its power (§ 67), and it was now pursuing a policy of expansion. In 1384 Florence had acquired Arezzo, and had then come into conflict with Siena, mainly on account of Montepulciano. Siena now allied herself with Gian Galeazzo, who thus obtained a foothold in Tuscany, and also the *signoria* of the city.

Francesco Novello, having entered into an understanding with Florence, recruited a force of mercenaries in Germany, and descended into Italy, by way of Friuli, at the head of an army. With the assistance of the Venetians he reconquered almost the whole of his dominion, including Padua (1390). The war, on the other hand, was developing favourably for Visconti, and unfavourably for the two Florentine *condottieri*; the French Comte d'Armagnac was defeated and taken

prisoner before Alessandria by the Viscontean *condottiero* Jacopo dal Verme, and Hawkwood, driven out of Emilia, was unable to preserve Tuscany from invasion by the same Jacopo. In 1392 a peace was concluded by which the Carraresi retained Padua, but Bassano, Belluno and Feltre remained in the hands of Visconti. It was agreed between Florence and Visconti that Florence had no interests in Lombardy, or Visconti in Tuscany; so that Siena recovered its liberty,

Gian Galeazzo now felt that it would strengthen his position in respect of his subjects, and the other Italian states, which were still largely hostile, if he were to consolidate his enlarged dominions by securing the recognition of the Empire; and from Wenceslas, the King of the Romans, he obtained the title of duke and the constitution of his possessions as the Duchy of Milan and the county of Pavia (1395). He then sought an alliance with Charles VI of France, having already provided the French with a foothold in Italy by giving Asti and his other Piedmontese possessions as a dowry to his daughter Valentina, on the occasion of her marriage to Louis d'Orleans, brother of Charles VI (1387). Charles was hoping to obtain the lordship of Genoa, but Gian Galeazzo cherished the same ambition, so that Charles went over to the anti-Viscontean party. In September 1396 a league was concluded in Pavia between Charles, Florence, Ferrara, Mantua and Padua. October was hardly past when Genoa, which since 1390 had again been a prey to civil discord, ceded itself to the King of France. But not even this could put an end to the strife of the factions, for the French governor, Marshal Boucicault, though he restored order by his vigorous methods of government, abolished some of the principal civic institutions.

Gian Galeazzo succeeded in holding out against this and other subsequent coalitions, partly by virtue of his diplomatic ability, but mainly because he was able to procure the services of the best *condottieri* of the day: Alberico da Barbiano, Jacopo dal Verme, Facino Cane, Carlo Malatesta. He now attacked the Gonzaga (1397), who were assisted by the other confederates, and also by Venice. Visconti resigned himself to leaving the Mantuans in peace, concluding an armistice (1398) which two years later was converted into a definitive

peace; but by this means he contrived to isolate Florence, leaving her without the support of her North Italian confederates. He was then once more in a position to turn his attention to Tuscany.

In Pisa the *signoria* of the Gambacorta had been overthrown by Jacopo d'Appiano (1392). Gian Galeazzo had entered into a league with him, but Jacopo succeeded in preserving his independence. After his death his son Gherardo ceded Pisa (1399) to Gian Galeazzo on the payment of 200,000 florins, retaining Piombino and Elba, which remained in the possession of his family for a couple of centuries. Gian Galeazzo once more acquired the *signoria* of Siena (1399), and also of Assisi, Spoleto and Nocera. He also took the Lunigiana from the Malaspina, and in Lucca he gave assistance to the anti-Florentine party of the Guinigi, who shortly afterwards made themselves lords of the city.

In Germany the philo-Viscontean Wenceslas was deposed and replaced by Robert, the Elector Palatine. In response to the solicitations of the Carraresi, the Florentines, and the Pope, Robert agreed to descend into Italy and make war upon Gian Galeazzo, whose ducal title he refused to recognize. But Robert's army, entangled in the Brescian valley, was defeated by the forces of Visconti (1401), and he withdrew from Italy (April 1402). Gian Galeazzo then resolved upon certain decisive strokes. He defeated Bentivoglio, *signore* of Bologna, and was acclaimed lord of the city (July 1402); he blockaded Florence on every side with his troops, and he made preparations for his coronation as King of Italy when he should enter the city, seeking to obtain the concurrence of the Venetians. But an epidemic which was then desolating Italy carried him off on the 3 September 1402. He was in his fifty-sixth year.

Gian Galeazzo Visconti, bold and crafty and fortunate in his external policies, was an active, just and magnanimous ruler of his own dominions. He caused the statutes of Milan to be revised by eminent jurists, who combined them in a single code. He organized the administration of the State, constituting a *giunta*—a sort of Ministry of the Interior—of properly qualified persons, the first head of this organization being a Venetian noble, Carlo Zeno. In the other cities of his dominions he strengthened and centralized the ducal

administration, constituting a complex of offices directly dependent upon himself, and subordinate to the *giunta* already described. He also asserted the power of the State over the clergy, appointing them to ecclesiastical office without the Papal confirmation. He undertook great works of public utility, and promoted the arts and industries, and culture in general. In 1386 he initiated the building of the Duomo of Milan, the greatest monument of Gothic architecture properly so-called in Italy; and in 1396 he began work on the Certosa di Pavia, a monument of equal splendour, in which the art of the Renaissance already begins to assert itself. He renovated the University of Pavia, summoning thither the most eminent scholars of the day; and he founded an academy of painting, and also a well-stocked library.

§ 69. THE CRISIS OF THE VISCONTEAN STATE.—Gian Galeazzo was succeeded, in accordance with his testament, by his eldest son Giovanni Maria, Duke of Milan, with the possession of Milan, Como, Lode, Cremona, Brescia, Bergamo, Piacenza, Parma, Reggio, Bologna, Siena and Perugia: and by his second son, Filippo Maria, Count of Pavia, with the possession of Pavia, Novara, Vercelli, Alessandria, Tortona, Vicenza, Verona, the Riviera di Trento, Bassano, Feltre, and Belluno. His natural but legitimated son Gabriele received Pisa, with Sarzana and the domains of Lunigiana. All these sons were minors; the testament therefore instituted a regency, at the head of which was the widow, Duchess Caterina (daughter of Bernabò), while among its members were some of the more illustrious Viscontean *condottieri*, such as Alberico da Barbiano and Jacopo dal Verme, and also the confidant and first chamberlain of the late duke, Francesco Barbavara.

It goes without saying that the powers which felt the magnificence of the Visconti to be a thorn in the flesh seized this opportunity of revenging themselves. A league was formed between the Este, the Carraresi, Florence, and the Pope of Rome, Boniface IX, who brought off a great *coup* by winning Alberico da Barbiano over to his side. Further, there were risings in Milan against Barbavara, who was tending to concentrate the power of government in his own person, and against the duchess, who seconded his efforts. They were both over-

thrown, and the duchess, who was cast into prison, died soon afterwards (October 1404).

Meanwhile the Viscontean dominion was disintegrating. In various Lombard cities local *signori* arose or re-established themselves. The regency entered into negotiations with the pontiff, ceding Bologna, Perugia, and the other cities of Umbria. Siena expelled her Milanese governor and re-established peace with Florence. Gabriele Visconti ceded Pisa to the Florentines (1405), who, notwithstanding the resistance of the Pisans, took possession of the city, thanks to an agreement with Giovanni Gambacorta, who had been created captain of the people (October 1406).

In the Veneto the Carraresi, intent on profiting by the Viscontean decadence, came into conflict with the Scaligers, who had re-entered Verona. They succeeded in taking the Scaligers prisoner and occupying Verona, but they found themselves opposed by Venice, for the government of Milan had ceded to the republic all its possessions in the Veneto, and the Venetians now began a war of extermination against the Carraresi. Verona and Padua itself were captured (1405); Francesco il Vecchio and Francesco Novello, being taken prisoner, were put to death in Venice (January 1406). The republic of the lagoons thus became the mistress of the Veneto, in the place of the local *signori* and the Visconti; a fact of the greatest importance, which, while it finally made Venice one of the great Italian principalities, was at the same time a decisive blow at the policy of a united Italy which had seemed possible under Gian Galeazzo. From Milan it would have been possible—and Gian Galeazzo had achieved it, or had been on the point of doing so—to govern the Veneto on the one hand, and on the other Florence and Central Italy; whereas Venice was too eccentrically placed to subject Lombardy and Tuscany, and too distracted by other interests—by her overseas interests, which afterwards constituted the foundation of her true greatness. During these years Venice recovered Zara and the Dalmatian coast, mostly by cession from Ladislas of Naples, who for a short time was King of Hungary (§ 70), and to a less extent by voluntary surrender. Sigismond of Luxemburg, King of Hungary and Emperor, took up arms to oppose the expansion of Venice, whether in Dalmatia, or in

Friuli, where the Patriarchate of Aquileia was still an imperial fief, or in the Veneto, where he supported the claims of the last of the Scaligers; but the war (1411-1413) went against him, and was interrupted by a truce.

After the liquidation of its Venetian dominions the Viscontean State was threatened with dissolution in Lombardy also, for the Viscontean captains, who had hitherto been loyal, were beginning to think of their own interests, and other *signori* too were seizing Viscontean territory. Thus, Pandolfo Malatesta took possession of Brescia; Ottobuono Terzo of Piacenza, Parma and Reggio, and Fucino Cane of Alessandria, Novara and Tortona; while Vercelli was taken by the Marquis of Monferrato, who, however, had to come to terms with Amedeo VIII of Savoy, who was likewise seeking to extend his dominions.

In the shrunken Viscontean dominion the factions and the *condottieri* were battling for supremacy. Jacopo dal Verme defeated his competitor Facino Cane, and endeavoured to re-establish order and justice in the duchy; but he received no support whatever from the cruel and incapable Duke Giovanni Maria. (It was one of his peculiarities to have persons whom he had sentenced torn to pieces by his savage dogs, which were expressly trained for this purpose.) Dal Verme abandoned Milan, which was closely blockaded by Facino Cane and by other *condottieri* and *signori* of adjacent cities. Giovanni Maria entered into a league with his brother Filippo Maria, the Count of Savoy, and Boucicault, the French governor of Genoa. Boucicault, however, had an enemy in Venice, for he had with him the last of the Scaligers and the Carraresi, whose purpose it was to re-enter Verona and Padua. For a moment Boucicault made himself the master of Milan, but Genoa revolted behind his back, ceding itself to the Marquis of Monferrato (September 1404). Shortly afterwards he was routed at Novi by Facino Cane, and compelled to withdraw from Italy. Facino Cane was then placed at the head of the government of Milan by the duke. He also assumed the government of Pavia, and he set about reorganizing the state and recovering the lost cities. But while he lay seriously ill a conspiracy of Milanese nobles was formed against the duke, who was killed during mass in the church

of San Gottardo (May 1412). In the evening of the same day Facino Cane died. Filippo Maria immediately married Facino's widow, Beatrice di Tenda, thus obtaining her domains, and on entering Milan he was proclaimed duke (June 1412).

§ 70. EXPANSION OF THE KINGDOM OF NAPLES. SICILY AND ARAGON.—Gian Galeazzo's attempt at achieving Italian hegemony from the north was followed by King Ladislas of Naples' attempt to achieve it from the south. The struggle between the Durazzesco party and the Angevins ended in 1400 with the victory of Ladislas: Louis II quitted the kingdom, returning to Provence. Ladislas now resumed his Hungarian adventure, in opposition to King Sigismond of Luxemburg, who had married the daughter of Louis I (§ 67), and was crowned King of Hungary at Zara. But as soon as he left the country the Angevin faction rebelled again, still with the Sanseverino at their head. Ladislas, returning to Hungary, suppressed the rebellion, severely punishing the Sanseverino and other rebels, and confiscating their estates.

Ladislas, after his return to the kingdom of Naples, devoted himself to a policy of expansion in Central Italy. There the State of the Church had returned to the conditions which had existed before the days of Albornoz; and those of the old *signori* who remained or had returned (the Manfredi to Faenza, the Ordelaffi to Forlì, the da Polenta to Ravenna, the Malatesta to Rimini, the Montefeltro to Urbino, the Varano to Camerino, etc.), had been joined by others, such as the Trinci in Foligno. Gregory XI, during the last years of his pontificate, had again placed the senator at the head of the administration, though the city retained the rest of its republican institutions. (For some time Charles of Durazzo was senator.) From 1383 onwards the Conservators and the Banderesi had governed the commune alone, but Urban VI had once more appointed a senator, triumphing over the resistance of the people.

Boniface IX (1389–1404), a Tomacelli of Naples, who had celebrated the Papal Jubilee in 1390 and in 1400, and who was bent on obtaining as much money as possible, resorted to the practice of conferring vicariates in the Papal State on various *signori*, and even on the

republican communes, drawing from them an annual tribute in addition to the payment of a lump sum. In this way, while filling the treasury, he succeeded in building up the old pontifical sovereignty. In Rome, after various vicissitudes, he succeeded in abolishing the *Banderesi* and destroying the political power of the artisans' corporations and the guilds of the *Balestrieri* (crossbowmen); and he re-established the "foreign" senator (replaced every six months) and the three Conservators, subjecting them to the increased authority of the pontiff. The better to hold the city in subjection, he restored and reinforced Castel Sant'Angelo, fortified the Vatican, and rebuilt and fortified the senatorial palazzo in Campodoglio. In Southern Latium Boniface IX consolidated the domain of the Church, defeating the Count of Fondi, Onorato Caetani, whom he deprived of almost all his domains. As we have seen (§ 69), on the death of Gian Galeazzo the pontiff recovered the Umbrian cities which had been included among the *signorie* of the duke.

Boniface IX had a loyal ally in Ladislas, to whom he had given recognition and support against the Angevins, and who supplied him with troops to be employed in restoring the Papal rule. But when Boniface was followed by Innocent VII (1404-1406), a member of the Abruzzese family of the Migliorati, the King of Naples began to assert his own power in the State of the Church. He intervened in Rome between the new Pope and the commune, which recovered a greater measure of autonomy; and he recruited a faction there, with the intention of making himself *signore*. He persuaded the Pope to create him rector of the Campagna and the *Màrittima* (that is, of Southern Latium) for five years, and then defender and standard-bearer of the Roman Church. At last, under Gregory XII (1406-1415), a Venetian Correr—the Pope being absent from Rome, and absorbed in negotiations for the composition of the Schism—succeeded in making himself the master of Rome (April 1408), which he governed by means of a senator; and from Rome he extended his dominion into Latium and Umbria. He took advantage of the fact that Gregory XII had now to contend with the ecclesiastical party which wished to resolve the Schism by means of a General Council; which actually assembled in Pisa (March 1409), independently of



the two pontiffs, deposed them both, and elected Pope Alexander V, who was followed (1410) by John XXIII, so that there were three Popes simultaneously. Gregory XII conferred upon Ladislas the government of the Ecclesiastical State in order to obtain his support against the conciliary faction; and Ladislas, on the pretext of combating the Council of Pisa and defending the true Pope, advanced into Tuscany. He aspired henceforth to dominion over Italy; it was said that he even aimed at the Empire, and that he had his clothes embroidered with a motto which was afterwards that of Caesar Borgia: "Aut Caesar aut nihil."

Standing in the way of his hegemony, as formerly in the way of Gian Galeazzo's, was Florence, and Florence concluded an alliance with Siena, with the new conciliary Pope, Alexander V, and with Louis II of Anjou, who had hurried into Tuscany in order to persuade the Pope of the validity of his rights to the kingdom of Naples. The league mustered an army, which included two *condottieri* who were destined to rise very rapidly to positions of eminence: Muzio Attendolo, from the Romagna, who bore the nickname of "lo Sforza," and the Umbrian, Braccio da Montone, known as Portebraccio. Before the forces of the league the army of Ladislas fell back; Rome itself was lost (end of December 1409), and acknowledged, first Alexander V, and then John XXIII, who entered the city in April 1411, while Gregory XII took refuge in the kingdom of Naples. Now Louis II invaded the kingdom, and defeated Ladislas at Toccasacca (May 1411); but he was unable to take advantage of his victory, and being overwhelmed by fresh forces collected by the energetic Ladislas, he withdrew from the kingdom (July) and returned to Provence.

John XXIII now came to terms with Ladislas (1412), appointing him *gonfaloniere* of the Church; Gregory XII took refuge with the Malatesta in Rimini. But Ladislas, in violation of his agreement, sent Sforza—now in his service—to occupy the Marches, while he himself took possession of Rome (June 1413), while John retreated to Tuscany, and then to Bologna. Once again Ladislas proceeded to invade Tuscany, with the intention of marching on Bologna; and once more Florence checked him, forcing him to enter into an agreement. On

the 6 August 1414 a premature death, the result of his dissolute life, carried Ladislas off, and he was succeeded by his sister Joanna (1414-1435).

This was the end of the Neapolitan dominion in the Papal State, although Castel Sant'Angelo remained in Neapolitan hands. Braccio da Montone now became a power in the domains of the Church, and he made himself lord of many cities in Umbria, including Perugia. At last he took possession of Rome, on the pretext of guarding the city for the future Pope, and he took up his residence in the Vatican (June 1417); but he was almost immediately expelled by his rival Sforza, sent by Joanna II.

The Council of Constance (1414), convoked by John XXIII at the urgent instance of the Emperor Sigismund, proclaimed the Emperor's superiority to the Pope, deposed John, accepted the renunciation of Gregory XII, deposed Benedict XIII, and elected (November 1417) Martin V, a Colonna, who was acknowledged by almost the whole of Christendom, so that the Schism was virtually ended. Martin V returned to Rome, and concluded an agreement with Braccio, leaving him in possession of Perugia and other cities as vicar of the Holy See.

While Ladislas of Naples was making his vain attempt to achieve hegemony in Central Italy, Sicily was becoming completely detached from the Italian mainland. On the death of Frederick II (or III, if we count the Swabian king) in 1377, the succession of his daughter Maria was not recognized by Pedro IV of Aragon, a member of the senior branch of the family, who ceded his rights in Sicily to his younger brother, Martin the Elder, who transferred them in his turn to his son, Martin the Younger. A war followed between the Aragonese and the Sicilians; or rather, the island was divided into Sicilian and Aragonese factions. The Aragonese won the upper hand; Queen Maria was taken to Spain as a prisoner and married to Martin the Younger; and Martin was crowned in Palermo (1392). However, the civil war continued until the end of the century. After the death of Maria (1402) and Martin the Younger (1409), Martin the Elder, King of Aragon, declared himself to be the heir; but in 1410 he died rather suddenly, and the House of Aragon became extinct. Then followed a

period of interregnum and confusion, until the Sicilians, together with the Aragonese, acknowledged the nephew of Martin the Elder (the son of his sister), Ferdinand of Castile, so that the two kingdoms of Aragon and Sicily were united.

§ 71. THE RECONSTITUTION OF THE VISCONTEAN PRINCIPALITY AND THE WARS WITH VENICE AND FLORENCE.—In a few years, Filippo Maria Visconti (1412–1447), having become Duke of Milan, restored the Viscontean dominion in Lombardy, partly by means of negotiations, partly by armed force. He was fortunate in having in his service the valiant *condottiero* Francesco Bussone da Carmagnola. To Alessandria and the other cities which came to him as the dowry of Beatrice di Tenda—whom he put to death, having accused her of adultery (1418)—he added, in succession, Lodi, Como, Crema, Vercelli, Piacenza, Cremona, Bergamo, Brescia, and Parma. This reconstitution of the Viscontean dominion was crowned by the acquisition of Genoa (1421), where the *dogato* had been re-established in 1413, in the place of the Monferrato *signoria*. Shortly afterwards Visconti quarrelled with Carmagnola, whom he suspected of disloyalty, and the latter went over to Venice, inciting the republic against the duke. To his incitations were added those of Florence, who had attempted to oppose the expansion of the Viscontean dominion in Romagna, but with no other effect than involving herself in a series of defeats inflicted by Visconti's *condottieri* (1423–1425).

In the meantime Venice had resumed (1418) the war against the Emperor Sigismond and the Patriarch of Aquileia, with most fortunate results. Feltre, Bellano, Udine, and the whole of Friuli fell into the hands of the Venetians (1420), and the patriarch was compelled to make peace, contenting himself with Aquileia and a few castles. Venice then turned her attention to Dalmatia, and either by force of arms or by the submission of the cities Traù, Spalato and Cattaro were added to Zara. From this period dates the stable dominion of Venice on the Dalmatian coast, and the development of a flourishing Venetian civilization. Then, looking further south, the republic took possession of Dulcigno, Scutari, and other Albanian strongholds,

thereby acquiring the complete dominion of the Adriatic and its outlets, the more so as Corfù was already a Venetian possession.

At this time two tendencies were manifesting themselves in the ranks of the Venetian aristocracy. One party, inspired by the conquests on the mainland, wished to pursue the policy of expansion on Italian soil; the other insisted that the fortunes of Venice were dependent upon her sea-power, and that the Venetians should not suffer themselves to be distracted from their maritime and commercial interests, only to engage in a policy of terrestrial conquest and become involved in Italian politics.

The first party, to which the Doge Francesco Foscari belonged (1423-1457), was victorious, and continued to assert itself throughout his exceptionally long *dogato*. At the beginning of 1426 Venice joined Florence, the Este and the Gonzaga in a league against the Duke of Milan: and before the year was out the Duke of Savoy, Amedeo VIII, and the Marquis of Monferrato had joined the league. The generalissimo of the league was Carmagnola, whose death by poison the duke had attempted to procure. He suddenly captured Brescia. Pope Martin V, to whom the Duke of Milan had restored the Viscontean conquests in Romagna, intervened as mediator, and in December 1426 a peace was concluded, by which the duke ceded the territory of Brescia to the Venetian republic, and his domains in Piedmont to the Duke of Savoy. But he did not implement the treaty, and the war broke out again. The Viscontean army—although it contained such valiant *condottieri* as Francesco Sforza, the son of Attendolo, and Nicolò Piccinino of Perugia—was completely defeated by Carmagnola at Maclodio near Brescia (12 October 1427). Carmagnola having released a great proportion of the prisoners—as was the custom of the time—the Venetians began to regard him with suspicion.

In his embarrassment the duke took measures to detach Amedeo VIII from the league (December 1427), ceding Vercelli to him and marrying one of his daughters. Again the Pope intervened, and with him the Marquis d'Este, and peace was concluded at the congress of Ferrara (April 1428). This confirmed the cession of Brescia and its territory to the Venetian republic, which also retained Bergamo and

part of the Cremonese territory. Carmagnola recovered his estates and fiefs in Milanese territory; and the Duke of Milan pledged himself to refrain from intervening in the affairs of Romagna and Tuscany.

The Florentines, who had acquired no territorial gains, now allowed their *condottiero* Nicolò Fortebraccio (the nephew of Braccio) to persuade them into attempting the conquest of Lucca. But Lucca was surreptitiously assisted by Filippo Maria Visconti, through his *condottieri*, who behaved as though they were no longer in his service. Lucca was saved, and at the same time the city threw off the *signoria* of the Guinigi; Florence thereupon appealed to Venice, asking that the war against Visconti should be resumed, as he was guilty of violating his agreement. Venice, partly on account of Visconti's intrigues in Brescia, consented to resume the war (1431), which at first, however, went rather in Visconti's favour. Carmagnola seemed to be sluggish and negligent in his conduct of the war; the Council of Ten arrested him by a trick, tried him on a charge of treason, forced a confession by means of torture, and put him to death (May 1432). This sentence was very largely due to the faction of the Loredano, which was hostile to the Doge Foscari, who had been Carmagnola's chief protector. In April 1433, mainly through the efforts of the Marquis d'Este, peace was again concluded in Ferrara, substantially on the basis of the *statu quo*. The Duke of Milan renewed his pledge to refrain from intervention in the affairs of Romagna and Tuscany.

§ 72. THE CRISIS IN THE CHURCH AND THE PAPAL POLICY. THE CONTEST FOR THE KINGDOM OF NAPLES.—With the installation of Martin V in Rome, at the end of September 1420, a new period of Papal policy began. Now that the exile in Avignon and the Great Schism was ended, the Papacy applied itself to the reconstruction of its temporal dominion in Italy, postponing the solution of the grave ecclesiastical problems which were summed up in the words: "Reform of the Church," whose urgency had been emphasized by the conciliary movement. The Church, it was said, was in need of reform, both in her head and in her members. As regards the head, one of the defects which made itself most keenly felt was the centralization and the fiscal character of the Papacy. This resulted in

excessive economic burdens and administrative difficulties (delay in obtaining decisions, the possibility of intrigue and error, etc.). and disregard of national and local interests and feelings. For a long while past the Roman Curia had not been a pattern of Christian virtues; the worldliness, luxury, licentious manners, avarice, and nepotism of the Popes were conspicuous, and became even more so during the 15th century. The Council of Constance had been justified in declaring that John XXIII was guilty of scandalous behaviour. (He had illegitimate sons.)

But it was not only the Roman Curia that gave cause for serious complaint. The members were in even worse case than the head. The higher clergy, especially in Germany and France, were recruited, as regards the great majority, from the nobility; so that one may say that the chapters were a sort of employment agency for the cadets of noble houses. In these cadets, and in the bishops who were chosen from them, there was no true religious vocation, and a worldly or positively immoral mode of life was very general among them. The anti-canonical appointment of a single cleric to a number of prebends was common, so that many of the prelates rarely visited their sees. The inferior clergy certainly did not benefit by such examples; too numerous and ignorant, they lived under the most wretched financial conditions, for the chapters and monasteries had incorporated a large proportion of the parishes, and they paid as little as possible to the priests appointed to them. Concubinage was very widespread. Even the religious Orders were completely decadent; they had increased their wealth, they lived softly, and their discipline was relaxed: the old religious and ascetic enthusiasm had diminished, and they were neglecting the work of culture and civilization which had been performed by the monasticism of earlier centuries. There had, of course, been attempts at reform in this domain, and new Orders had been instituted, but without serious results. It will be remembered that a section of the Franciscans who had not become Fraticelli after the dispute with John XXII (in respect of their poverty, § 59), and who had finally submitted themselves to the Pope, formed themselves into the congregation of the Observants, who were distinguished by their stricter life from the congregation of Conventuals; though the

final constitution of the two communities as distinct Orders did not take place until 1517. Another trouble arose from the conflicts between the regular clergy, especially the Mendicants, and the secular clergy, who complained of the competition of the regulars in the exercise of pastoral functions, and of the privileges conceded to them at the expense of the parish priests and the bishops.

Italy was far less sensitive than other countries to criticisms directed against the Papacy, for to her the Papacy brought moral prestige and economic prosperity. In Germany and Flanders mystical tendencies were making themselves felt at the end of the 13th century, and in the 14th (Meister Eckhart, Jan van Ruysbroek), which led to an enhancement of religious individualism, and to the increase or multiplication of religious associations of laymen and laywomen (Beguins, Beghards, Friends of God); and all these activities created a soil which was fruitful of dissident tendencies. Of true heretical movements the most notable were Wycliffism (John Wycliff, *d.* 1384) or Lollardism in England, and Hussitism (John Huss, condemned to the stake by the Council of Constance, 1415) in Bohemia, both movements of a national character, anti-Papal and Protestant *avant la lettre*.

The Council of Constance had adopted only a few inadequate measures of ecclesiastical reform, referring the task to future Councils, which were to be periodically convoked. Under Martin V, however, only a synod was held, sparsely attended and inconclusive, at Pavia and Siena (1423-1424).

Pope Martin, on the other hand, initiated the immediate Papal policy of transforming the conglomeration of communes and *signorie* under the pontifical suzerainty which had hitherto constituted the temporal dominion of the Church into a true principality, similar in type to the other Italian principalities. In this task the Popes were much less successful than their lay colleagues, owing to the extreme multiplicity of the ecclesiastical territories, the lack of a secure and firmly established centre, the discontinuity of the government, due to the Papal successions, and lastly, the nepotism of the pontiffs, which, in an elective monarchy, without a dynasty, was bound to conflict with the interests of the State. The Popes, who were more and more

involved in Italian politics, were becoming one of its guiding elements. The true and effective dominion of the Popes in Rome dates from the pontificate of Martin V, who reduced the Senator and the Conservators to the status of mere municipal officers. He re-established the Papal sovereignty in the Marches and Romagna, and we have seen that in the latter region he was able to hold his own against the invading forces of Visconti. He bestowed many favours on his kinsmen, the Colonna, making them the masters of a great part of Latium, and placing them in command of fortresses in Umbria and Romagna.

Pope Martin also exercised an active participation in the affairs of the kingdom of Naples, a Papal fief. Joanna II, a dissolute queen, had no sons, though she had been twice married. When dissension arose between the queen's favourite, the Grand Seneschal Giovanni Caracciolo, and the head of the army, or Grand Constable, Attendolo Sforza, the latter came to an understanding with the Pope, and they both declared in favour of Louis III of Anjou, who had succeeded to his father (*d.* 1417). The queen, in order to hold her own against the pretender Louis III, adopted as her heir Alfonso of Aragon, King of Aragon and Sicily, the son of Ferdinand of Castile (§ 70). Braccio Fortebraccio was the general of the Aragonese party, and Sforza of the Angevin party: the two *condottieri* made war within the kingdom, while on the seas there was war between the Catalan-Aragonese fleet and the navy of Genoa, an old enemy of the Catalans, who were also attacking Corsica. Alfonso of Aragon, on coming to Naples in June 1421, prevailed over the Angevins; Sforza became reconciled with him, and he obtained a preponderance over the queen even in the government of the kingdom. Matters came to a rupture between Joanna and her adopted son; she revoked the adoption, and transferred it (June 1423) to Louis III of Anjou, an action which was ratified by the Pope. The war broke out again, Sforza fighting for the Angevin and Braccio for the Aragonese; but they both met their death in 1425, Sforza being drowned in the Pescara (January), while Braccio, defeated and mortally wounded, was taken prisoner near Aquila by the Angevin *condottiero* Caldora (June). Alfonso was recalled to Aragon by the affairs of that country, and for some years the Angevin party was predominant. Then Caracciolo, on returning



In February 1435 Joanna died, after naming as her heir René (Renato) of Anjou, who had recently succeeded to his brother Louis III.

To Pope Martin V the death of Braccio was opportune, for it enabled him to place under the direct rule of the Holy See the Umbrian cities which Braccio had held in *signoria*. Reacting against his nepotistic policy, in the Conclave which followed upon his death (February 1431), the cardinals insisted on a series of articles, to be observed by the new Pope, by which the College of Cardinals was given a large share in the government of the Church. From this time onwards such capitulations were frequently stipulated by the Conclaves, revealing a tendency towards an aristocratic and constitutional government of the Church; but nothing, whether in theory or in practice, guaranteed their observation on the part of the Pope elect, who could always declare that they were not obligatory upon the supreme pontifical power.

The new Pope, Eugenius IV (1431-1447), a Venetian Condulmer, was soon at war with the Colonna, who had demanded the restoration of territories conceded by his predecessor. The Colonna had allies in the Prefetti di Vico, who were still lording it over Northern Latium, or the Tuscan Romagna, and they also entered into relations with Filippo Maria Visconti, while Queen Joanna supported the pontiff, as did Florence and Venice also. In Rome a conspiracy against the pontifical authority was repressed with much bloodshed. The Colonna were compelled to make peace (September 1431) on terms favourable to the pontiff.

The latter now encountered very serious difficulties in connection with the new Oecumenical Council of Basle, which had assembled in July 1431, and before long was in open conflict with the Pope. The Emperor Sigismund, having entered Italy to assume the royal crown in Milan (November 1431) and the imperial crown in Rome (May 1433), acted as mediator. Visconti, on the other hand, seized this opportunity of resuming operations in Central Italy. He began by inciting Nicolò Fortebraccio, only recently a *condottiero* in the service of the Pope. Nicolò, joined by the Colonna, marched upon

Rome in August 1433, claiming to be the general of the Council of Basle, and for months he held the city besieged. Another Viscontean *condottiero*, Count Francesco Sforza (of whom there has already been mention) invaded the Marches, also by agreement with the duke, and he too claimed to be the general of the Council, the Duke of Milan calling himself its vicar. From the Marches Sforza made his way into Umbria and Roman Tuscany. Pope Eugenius then resigned himself to submitting himself to the Council (December 1433). He came to terms with Sforza, appointing him vicar in the March of Ancona and *gonfaloniere* of the Church. Sforza deserted the duke, fighting for the Pope in the Papal State against Nicolò Fortebraccio, who was joined by Nicolò Piccinino, sent thither by Visconti. Rome, oppressed by the Bracceschi, rebelled against the Pope (May 1434), restoring the republican government of the Banderesi. The Pope, in disguise, made a dramatic escape on the Tiber, and on reaching Ostia he took ship for Tuscany.

Meanwhile the war between Florence and Venice on the one side, and the Duke of Milan on the other, had broken out again (1434) in Romagna, where the duke had garrisoned Imola and Bologna. To the Viscontean *condottiero* Nicolò Piccinino the league opposed Francesco Sforza. Visconti supported an attempt on the part of the Carraresi to recapture Padua; but the only result was that Marsilio da Carrara was put to death by the Venetians (1435). In August 1435 a peace was concluded by which Imola and Bologna were returned to the pontiff. In Rome, after five months of the republic, the pontifical government was restored.

In the State of the Church the government was now exercised, on behalf of Pope Eugenius, in his continued absence, by Bishop Giovanni Vitelleschi—afterwards Patriarch of Alessandria and cardinal—a soldier rather than a churchman. He applied himself with great energy to restoring the pontifical power in Latium, making war upon the petty tyrants, beginning with the Prefetti di Vico, whose dominion was finally shattered, although their place was very soon taken by the Orsini. The patriarch, as he was called, subdued the Colonna also, took Palestrina, and confiscated all their cities.

These operations of Vitelleschi's were accompanied by horrible acts of devastation: whole towns and villages were razed to the ground.

§ 73. COSIMO DI MEDICI, ALFONSO OF ARAGON, AND FRANCESCO SFORZA.—In Florence, in the meanwhile, a great change had been effected in the internal condition of the city. After an unsuccessful conspiracy (1400) of the popular faction against the oligarchy of the Albizzi, the latter had still further consolidated their power. Of the Medici, who were among the notables of this faction, which had once again been defeated, some were exiles and some were "admonished." They therefore devoted themselves wholly to business, and especially to banking, becoming extremely prosperous. Giovanni de' Medici, who became the Pope's banker, was concerned in very important operations at the time of the Council of Constance. Thanks to the more moderate tendencies of Nicolò da Uzzano, who was predominant in the faction, the ruling oligarchy was reconciled with Giovanni and his son Cosimo—who apparently had no further intention of disputing the power of the Albizzi—and they were readmitted to office.

The unfortunate outcome of the republic's many wars with Visconti, together with the fiscal burdens resulting therefrom, began to shake the prestige of the oligarchy, which on the first signs of discontent thought to restore order by taking still further rigorous measures against the *popolo minuto*, and they sought to obtain Giovanni de' Medici's approval of them. Giovanni, on the contrary, declared himself in favour of lightening the burdens weighing upon the people, which enormously increased his credit with them. Now a section of the *popolo grasso* also rallied to the Medici, and their power became almost equal to that of the Albizzi. Giovanni prevailed upon the latter to introduce the *catasto* or land tax, which rendered possible a more equitable distribution of taxation.

Giovanni died in 1423, leaving enormous wealth to his two sons Cosimo (the elder) and Lorenzo. The direction of the Medicean party devolved upon Cosimo. After the death of Nicolò da Uzzano, whose policy it had been to live at peace with the Medici, an extreme faction prevailed in the party of the Albizzi. When in September

1433 a *signoria* was elected by lot which was entirely favourable to the Albizzi, Cosimo was tried on a charge of treason in respect of his relations with Sforza during the war with Lucca (§ 71), and was sentenced to confinement for ten years in Padua. A splendid exile, he continued his banking operations in Padua and Venice, and at the same time he increased his patronage of the arts and letters. In September 1434 the drawing of lots resulted in a government which favoured the Medici, who in their turn took proceedings against the leaders of the Albizzi. Matters came to an armed conflict; the new *signoria* was victorious, Cosimo was recalled, and his adversaries were banished. Cosimo's return was a triumph; and from that time onwards, although the republican forms of the government remained intact, he exercised an effective supremacy in the city.

On the death of Joanna II hostilities were resumed between the Angevins and the Aragonese; Pope Eugenius IV claimed that the kingdom had devolved upon the Holy See, and sent Vitelleschi thither. At first the Duke of Milan supported René of Anjou, and the Genoese fleet—then under the Visconti—encountered at Ponza the Aragonese armada which was besieging Gaeta, inflicting on it an absolute defeat (August 1435). Alfonso of Aragon himself was made a prisoner and taken to Milan. But then the duke and he found it possible to come to a complete agreement; and Visconti ordered the Genoese to assist Alfonso's operations with their squadron. Then the discontent which for some time past had been simmering in Genoa against the duke, who had been pledging the territory of the republic to private persons in order to obtain money, burst into open rebellion (December 1435), and the republic, free once more, restored the government of the Doges.

Genoa then entered into a league with Venice and Florence, and the war was resumed in Lombardy and Tuscany, Sforza acting as general of the league. He was opposed by Piccinino. The Pope also joined the league, and the most notable feat of arms in this campaign was the rout of Piccinino's forces by the Florentine and Papal troops at Anghiari in the Casentino (June 1440). Nevertheless, the league was not definitely victorious; but the duke, seeing that his *condottieri* were inclined to detach cities from his duchy in order to become

their *signori*, thought it better to come to an agreement with Sforza, and through him with the allies. Count Sforza finally married Bianca, the natural daughter of the duke, who had already been promised to him on many occasions, and a peace was concluded (November 1441) which practically re-established the previous territorial relations, though it stipulated the assignment of Cremona to Sforza as Bianca's dowry, while Genoa retained her liberty.

As Pope Eugenius IV had intervened against the Duke of Milan, so in the kingdom of Naples he intervened against Alfonso of Aragon, declaring himself in favour of the Angevin. But the expedition of the Patriarch—and now Cardinal—Vitelleschi did not achieve any lasting success, and he was compelled to withdraw his forces. Suspected by the Pope of dealings with the Duke of Milan, he was arrested in Rome, and being wounded in a scuffle at the moment of his arrest, he died a prisoner in Castel Sant'Angelo (1440).

Alfonso of Aragon, held a hostage by the Pope, entered into negotiations with the Council of Basle, which was again in conflict with the Pope. Eugenius dissolved the Council (1437), convoking another in Florence and in Ferrara (1438–1439), which voted an ephemeral union between the Greek and Latin churches. The fathers of Basle deposed Eugenius and nominated Amedeo VIII of Savoy (1439: § 74), who took the name of Felix V. He was the last of the anti-Popes. The various powers were on the side of Eugenius, or remained neutral.

Alfonso had definitely obtained the upper hand in the kingdom of Naples. The city of Naples, which was still in the possession of the Angevins, was besieged. Alfonso succeeded in effecting an entrance by the same aqueduct by which Belisarius had entered nine hundred years earlier, and so became master of the city (2 June 1442). René of Anjou left the kingdom, and Pope Eugenius made peace with Alfonso, granting him the investiture (July 1442).

One of the reasons that induced Pope Eugenius to come to terms with Alfonso was the fact that the pontiff wanted his help to recover the Marches from Francesco Sforza. Already, in accordance with the usual see-saw character of his treacherous policy, Sforza's father-in-law, Filippo Maria Visconti, had turned against him, and had offered

the pontiff his *condottiero* Nicolò Piccinino for the reconquest of the Marches; and Sforza had actually lost a great part of the territory. But now the duke changed sides once more; he induced Alfonso, who had entered the Marches in order to make war upon Sforza, to withdraw, and he allied himself with Florence and Venice in support of Sforza. Eugenius therefore made peace with Sforza (October 1444), leaving him in possession of nearly the whole of the Marches. During this war Nicolò Piccinino was killed.

The peace was of brief duration. Sigismondo Malatesta, lord of Rimini, although he was Sforza's son-in-law, turned against him, because he had bought Pesaro from another Malatesta. The anti-Sforza league was reconstituted between Sigismondo, Pope Eugenius, Naples, and Milan; Florence and Venice were still for the count, and also Bologna and Genoa (1446). The Marches, in which the rebellion against Sforza was spreading, were slipping from his hold, and this time he resolved to abandon them; the Duke of Milan, on the other hand, was hard pressed by the Venetian army. During the war, when Sforza sought *rapprochement* with the duke and Alfonso, Filippo Maria Visconti died: on the 13 August 1447. Eugenius IV had already died in February.

§ 74. FRANCESCO SFORZA, DUKE OF MILAN. THE PEACE OF LODI.—Filippo Maria left no descendants who could claim the right to succeed him in accordance with feudal law. Those who aspired to the succession, or who at all events hoped to plunder the duchy, were Ludovico IX, Duke of Savoy, brother of the widowed Duchess of Milan, the Marquis of Monferrato, the Duke of Orleans (a descendant of Valentina Visconti, who took possession of Asti, which had formerly been her dowry: § 68), and King Alfonso of Naples, who alleged that Filippo Maria had made a testament in his favour. Most of all, Sforza, the dead man's son-in-law, hoped to obtain the succession, but for the time being he did not press his claims. The city of Milan rose to cries of "Viva la libertà!" and proclaimed the "Ambrosian Republic" under twenty-four "Captains and Defenders of Liberty" (four for each ward). Como, Alessandria, Novara adhered to the Milanese republic; Pavia and Parma also reclaimed their liberty;

Lodi and Piacenza ceded themselves to the Venetians, who were more than ever ambitious of acquiring the whole duchy.

Francesco Sforza, who already possessed Cremona, undertook for the time being to serve the Ambrosian republic, being promised Brescia and Verona when they had been wrested from the Venetians. He reconquered Piacenza for the republic, but, heedless of the latter's rights, he accepted the *signoria* offered him by Pavia, and shortly afterwards he obtained the *signoria* of Tortona also: but Bartolomeo Colleoni, another *condottiero* in the service of the republic, restored the city to Milan. In 1448 the Venetians suffered two signal defeats: their riverine fleet being defeated at Casalmaggiore and their land forces at Caravaggio. But in the same year Venice and Sforza entered into an alliance against the Milanese republic, stipulating that the Adda must constitute the future frontier. Sforza then occupied almost the whole of the territory between the Adda and the Ticino, with Novara, Alessandria, and Pavia, and in the spring of 1449 he initiated the blockade against Milan. Then, however, the Venetians effected a change of front, and after vainly attempting to induce Sforza to renounce Milan and part of the duchy, they allied themselves with the Ambrosian republic (September 1449). They sought to obtain the alliance of Florence against Sforza, but the city remained neutral, while Cosimo di Medici supported him on his own account, and endeavoured to persuade the republic to take his side. In Milan the famished people revolted and opened the gates to Sforza, who was proclaimed *signore* and assumed the title of Duke of Milan (25 March 1450), regardless of the fact that the Emperor Frederick III would not grant him the investiture. The opposition of Charles VIII of France, who claimed that Milan should have devolved upon the Orleans family, was never more than platonic.

There was now a general reversal of alliances. Naples allied herself with Venice, and Florence with Milan. Bologna and Mantua also supported Milan; on the other side were Monferrato, Savoy and Siena. During the new war, which actually began in 1452, the King of France, at the instance of the Florentines, came over to Sforza's side, and supported René of Anjou against Alfonso of Aragon. René even entered Lombardy, to fight for the duke, but then, having quar-

relled with him, he withdrew to Asti. The capture of Constantinople and the Turkish menace (§ 76) led Venice to conclude the Peace of Lodi (9 April 1454), which left the duke, of the territory conquered from the Venetians, only the Ghiara d'Adda. Florence then adhered to the peace, and on Sforza's initiative a "Most Holy League" (*San-tissima Lega*) was entered into by Milan, Venice and Florence (30 August 1454).

Alfonso of Aragon was opposed to the peace and to the league, but he finally adhered to it, in January 1455; the Pope had already done so. A place was reserved in the league for all the states "*intra terminos italicos*." But the peace was not really stable, nor was the league really efficient, although it was repeatedly renewed; nevertheless, it did on the whole effect a certain consolidation of the Italian states until the end of the century. This pacification and this general agreement were largely due to the efforts, especially in relation to the Turkish peril, of the new Pope, Nicholas V (1447-1455): Tommaso Parentucelli, a native of Sarzana, of humble origin, who owed his rise mainly to his great learning and his humanistic culture. He was a notable patron of the arts and literature. During his pontificate the schism of Basilea was finally composed. Felix V having abdicated, the Fathers of Basle (who in June 1448 removed to Lausanne) themselves elected Nicholas V, and dissolved the Council. Although formally successful, the conciliary movement had actually been defeated; the question of the reform of the Church was still unsolved.

Nicholas V applied himself, with considerable success, to maintaining a sound and orderly administration of the State of the Church. In restoring the pontifical finances, which had been exhausted by the wars of Eugenius, he employed the services of Cosimo di Medici. These finances profited greatly by the Jubilee of 1450, when Rome was crowded with visitors, though it was disturbed by an outbreak of pestilence. In March 1452 Nicholas V crowned Frederick III in Rome, not only as Emperor, but also—in violation of secular custom—King of Italy. In 1453 the tranquillity of the Papal State was disturbed by the conspiracy of Stefano Porcari in Rome: an enthusiastic and fantastical humanist, eager for glory, who sought to repeat the feat of Cola di Rienzo, and restore the ancient republic. The conspiracy was



to have taken action at Epiphany, 1453, but it was discovered the day before and suppressed, Porcari and some of his accomplices being hanged. Frederick III, on returning from Rome, conferred on the Marquis Borso d'Este the title of Duke of Modena and Reggio (1452); Paul II, in 1471, granted him the title of Duke of Ferrara. Such titles were the manifestation and the juridical form assumed by the consolidation of the Italian principalities. In 1416 the Count of Savoy, Amedeo VIII (1391-1434), had received the title of Duke of Savoy from the Emperor Sigismund. Shortly afterwards—in 1418—he united the Savoyard states in his own hands, thanks to the extinction of the Achaian branch of the house, and he enlarged them by the acquisition of Vercelli from Visconti (1427), and of other feuds or communes, which were enclosed within his states, or conterminous with them. He also provided for their administration by means of a body of general statutes.

## CHAPTER XII

### *THE BALANCE OF POWER—THE RENAISSANCE*

§ 75. ITALY AFTER THE PEACE OF LODI.—The forty years which elapsed between the peace of Lodi (1454) and the advent of Charles VIII (1494) have always been regarded as a period of stability and peace in respect of the relations between the Italian states, and of consolidation within them. Italy, liberated from foreign domination, seemed to have attained to a notable degree of national organization, by the definitive constitution of the five great states which decided the destinies of the peninsula, and which, in their mutual contacts and their equilibrium, formed a sort of confederation, and sometimes entered into leagues properly so-called.

The reality, if we consider it closely, is rather different. To begin with, the five principalities tolerated the existence on their frontiers of a number of smaller states, which at times encroached upon their territory, and some of which were of considerable importance. Among these were independent republics (Genoa, Siena, Lucca), minor principalities (Duchy of Savoy, Duchy of Ferrara), small independent *signorie* (*signoria* of Piombino), small fiefs of the Empire (those of the Carretto, Marchesi del Finale, in the Riviera di Ponente, and those of the Marchesi Malaspina at Massa and Carrara), and the very small fiefs which existed in such numbers in the Langhe, for example, and in Lunigiana. Then there were the miniature states which were vassals of the larger states, above all in the Papal State, where besides the Este of Ferrara there were still a number of *signorie* in Romagna, in the Marches, and in Latium; a *signoria* of particular importance being that of the Montefeltro, created Dukes of Urbino by the Pope in 1474. Moreover, the consolidation of the larger states was subject to restrictions. Notwithstanding certain measures of absolutist centralization, they had to a great extent the character of a conglomerate of divers

cities and territories, which was no longer a civic government and had not yet become a united territorial state of the modern type. This holds good above all of the Papal State, which little deserved this name as yet, and perhaps never deserved it until the French Revolution, and in which the most arbitrary absolutism (dependent on the personal will of an elective prince, whose rule was generally of brief duration) was combined with extreme weakness. The Florentine State was undermined by discontent and rebellion in the subject cities. In the kingdom of Naples the perpetual internal conflict between the monarchy and the barons grafted itself upon the opposing claims of Aragon and Anjou. The Milanese State was more stable, but even here there were still party quarrels between the nobles in the capital itself. The most stable of all the states was the Venetian, whether by reason of the inherent strength of the predominant city, or because the government had succeeded in balancing firmness of control, in its dominions on the mainland, by an impartial justice, while the local administrative autonomies were to a great extent preserved.

In Venice the governmental system had the organic robustness that comes of slow and progressive formation, the tradition of centuries (of thousands of years, in the belief of the common people), the prestige of maritime and economic supremacy, and the political basis furnished by a very numerous aristocracy, which was by no means a closed caste, but which for many generations had been accustomed to and interested in political life. The other Italian principalities (including that of the Medici of Florence) retained to a great extent the character of states improvised by violence, cunning, and chance, with no true political and moral foundation, whether in the divine right and traditional prestige of an ancient dynasty or in the free and organic expression of the popular will. The imperial and Papal investitures were mere juridical formalities, without effect upon the neutrality of princes and peoples. And the peoples had no share in public life; they were passive and estranged; the administration of the State had become the purely professional concern of the prince and his officials. In the relations between the Italian principalities there were similar weaknesses and uncertainties. The confederations of these states were never strong and stable; equilibrium resulted not from a common desire for peace

and justice, but from jealousy and mutual suspicion. The forty peaceful years include, as we shall see, at least four wars, each of which might have convulsed the political life of Italy.

Even the exclusion of the foreigner from Italian affairs was relative. Sicily, on the threshold of the kingdom of Naples, was united to a Spanish State. Asti was in the possession of French princes, the Orléans, who had laid claim to the Duchy of Milan. The Duke of Savoy, almost a vassal of the King of France, who played hardly any part in Italian life, by no means constituted a barrier to the foreigner. Genoa had grown accustomed to the suzerainty of France. The French Angevins were still pretenders to the crown of Naples. There was always the danger that a powerful foreign state might annex some portion of Italy, which explains why Sforza and the Medici had supported King Ferrante against the French Angevins. But these were opportunistic valuations, which might be replaced by other valuations of the kind, having the opposite sense; there was no national consciousness, decidedly opposed to the annexation of a portion of Italy by a foreign power; especially as such annexations appeared to be of a personal character, leaving the individuality of the annexed state intact. The political art had developed in Italy, and the Italian rulers enjoyed a great reputation for experience and adroitness. But their ability was degenerating into virtuosity and intrigue, with no far-sighted ideas of direction, no tenacious and upright will. Their chief concern was to safeguard their power and if possible to increase it; there was no question of undertaking a popular and national task for reasons of conscience.

§ 76. ITALY AND THE OTTOMAN TURKS.—The narrowness of vision of the Italian principalities, and the lack of a national policy, were made evident by the Turkish expansion in the East, which threatened the territories of certain Italian states, the commercial interests of the whole peninsula, and the security of the peninsula itself.

Having overthrown the power of Byzantium, the Ottoman Turks, who in the first half of the 14th century had founded a state in Asia Minor, entered Europe in 1354, occupying Gallipoli; after which, in

little more than a century, they achieved the conquest of the Balkan peninsula. On the 29 May 1453 Constantinople was taken by Mahomet II, after a desperate resistance in which 700 Genoese took part, under the command of a Giustiniani; and this was the end of the Byzantine or "Roman" Empire.

The Byzantine Empire and the Balkan States had been unable to dam the tide of Ottoman conquest; nor did the Western world put forth a vigorous, concerted and continuous effort to thrust it back, even though the Popes, above all in the age of the Renaissance—as under Calixtus III and Pius II—frequently and forcibly preached the Crusade. The main reason for this was the fact that the development of the national states, and the decline of religious sentiment, had diminished the sense of Christian unity and solidarity. The Italian republics of Venice and Genoa were directly interested, but their forces, being exclusively maritime, were utterly incapable of holding up the enemy. They suffered serious casualties; the Genoese very soon lost nearly all their colonies (in 1456 Imbros, Samothrace, Lemnos, in 1462 Lesbos, in 1475 the settlements in the Crimea); while Venice, though she resisted longer, suffered the same fate. On the morrow of the fall of Constantinople the Venetians made peace with the Turks; but in 1463 the Turks resumed hostilities, seizing Argos and other territories in the Morea. A Venetian expedition recovered Argos and laid siege to Corinth, but was forced to retreat before the advance of a great Turkish army. To the crusade so fervently organized by Pius II, who himself went to Ancona with the intention of taking part in it, Venice contributed her fleet, which reached Ancona shortly before the death of the Pope, on the eve of the vigil of the Assumption (1464). Nothing came of the crusade; war between Venice and Turkey followed, with varying fortunes; the admiral Vittor Capello recovered Athens, but a Venetian army was utterly defeated before Patras. In 1470 a great Turkish force took Negroponte after a most obstinate defence.

The anti-Turkish league of the Italian powers which was organized by Paul II in 1471 was quite ineffective, and the efforts of his successor Sixtus IV were equally futile. On the other hand, the Turks made two incursions into Friuli (1473, 1477), and the Venetian Republic submitted to an onerous peace (January 1479), ceding Scutari (Albania),

restoring the conquests made during the war, and pledging itself to large payments of money. In the following year Mahomet, who was seriously considering the conquest of Italy, occupied Otranto (August 1480), which was recovered, with difficulty, by the King of Naples (September 1481). The death of Mahomet (May 1481) saved Italy from a very real danger.

Venice, during this period, made one important acquisition which in some degree compensated her for the losses which she had suffered: the kingdom of Cyprus. The Venetian Caterina Cornaro, the widow of the last Lusignan (the French dynasty of Lusignan had ruled Cyprus for three hundred years), handed over the government of the island to Venice, and finally made formal cession of the kingdom (1489).

§ 77. THE WAR OF JOHN OF ANJOU AND THE NEW GENERATION OF PRINCES.—Alfonso, King of Naples, in order to make it more difficult for the French and the Angevins to invade the kingdom, sought to obtain influence over Genoa by placing the government in the hands of the Adorno exiles in the place of the dominant Campofregoso; and having equipped a great fleet which he pretended was to be used against the Turks, he proceeded to attack the city. The result was that the Doge Pietro di Campofregoso gave the city in *signoria* to Charles VII of France, who sent thither John of Anjou, the son of René, to take possession (May 1458). It became evident immediately that the Italic League would take no effective action to prevent this resumption of the Franco-Angevin offensive in Italy. Alfonso continued his operations against Genoa, on land with the support of the exiles, and also on the sea; but they were interrupted by his death (27 June 1458). He was known as Alfonso the Magnanimous, chiefly because of his liberal treatment of the *literati*, who praised him accordingly; but his personal reputation was tarnished by his scandalous habits, while as a king he burdened his people with taxation that was excessive even when his wars were taken into account.

Alfonso having no legitimate sons, Aragon, with Sicily and Sardinia, passed to his brother John; but he bequeathed the kingdom of Naples to his natural son Ferdinand (Ferrante). Ferdinand had to encounter the opposition of the successor to Pope Nicholas V: Calixtus III

(1455–1458), of the Catalan family of Borgia. Calixtus was lavish of favours to his nephews, two of whom he created cardinals (one of them being Rodrigo Borgia, the future Alexander VI), while another nephew, a layman, the brother of Rodrigo, was made Captain-General of the Church and governor of a number of cities in the Papal State. The Pope's compatriots filled the civil and curial offices in Rome, exercising a despotic government which rendered the name of Catalan hateful. On the death of Alfonso Calixtus III declared that the kingdom of Naples (or of Sicily *di qua dal Faro*, as it was then called) had devolved upon the Holy See, inviting the pretenders to submit their claims to Rome. It was believed that he wished to confer the kingdom upon Pier Luigi. Ferrante appealed against the verdict of the Pope to the future Council; Milan and Florence declared for him. On the 6 August 1458 Calixtus III died; the supremacy of the Catalans was overthrown and Pier Luigi himself fled to Civitavecchia, where he died soon afterwards.

Calixtus was followed by Pius II (1458–1464): Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, the son of an exiled Sienese noble, a distinguished scholar and diplomatist, who had taken the part of the Council of Basle, had been secretary to Felix V, and then to the Emperor Frederick III, and had afterwards become bishop and cardinal. Wholly engrossed in the crusade against the Turks (§ 76), he hastily effected a reconciliation between the Roman Curia and Ferrante, acknowledging him as King of Naples in return for a promise of an annual payment and the restitution of Benevento and Terracina. But an Angevin party again took shape in the kingdom, fostered above all by the resistance of the feudal barons to the royal power, and led by the Orsini, Princes of Taranto: and this party declared for John of Anjou. Francesco Sforza took Ferrante's part; and so, notwithstanding the urging of the King of France, did Pius II, a nephew of whose had married a natural daughter of Ferrante, and was created Duke of Sessa and Amalfi. The Angevin party had the support of the two *condottieri*, Jacopò Piccinino (son of Nicolò), who had already attempted to obtain a *signoria* for himself in the Papal State, and Sigismondo Malatesta, the lord of Rimini, famous as a builder (the Tempio Malatestiano, § 79). John of Anjou and Piccinino were completely defeated at Troia in Apulia (1462); Piccinino came to terms with Ferrante (1463), but was finally

arrested and slain in Naples—an act of revenge on the part of Sforza. Sigismund in his turn was compelled to make submission to the Pope, who left him only Rimini, while his brother Domenico was allowed to retain Cesena. Domenico sold Cervia to the Venetians, who had obtained Ravenna some years previously. In 1464 John of Anjou quitted the kingdom.

The Angevin war was connected with the war fought for the possession of Genoa. The Genoese were soon weary of French rule; and with help from Milan they finally shook it off in 1461. They then passed under the dominion of Francesca Sforza (1464), who had previously concluded an agreement with Louis XI of France, whose friend he had been before he ascended the throne.

In the year that saw the end of the Angevin war Cosimo the Elder died (1 August 1464). His power in Florence had grown from strength to strength. He governed through the extraordinary commissions or *balie*, which, appointed by the people under pressure from the dominant faction, proceeded with plenary powers to nominate the magistrates and the government of the State. He had difficulties with some of his too powerful and arrogant partisans, first among whom was the very wealthy Luca Pitti, the founder of the palace which still bears his name.

Cosimo's eldest son, Piero, already close on fifty, and extremely infirm (he was known as Piero the Gouty), proved to be an incapable ruler. In his preoccupation with the family finances, he was ill-advised enough to call in the long-term loans made by his father, thereby alienating many. An anti-Medicean party was formed, but it was rent by internal conflicts, for certain of its members, like Pitti, aimed at replacing the *signoria* of the Medici by their own, while others, like Soderini, were in favour of an effective restoration of popular government. The Medicean party succeeded in detaching Pitti from the other leaders, who, Soderini included, found themselves compelled to leave the city. The anti-Mediceans were excluded from the magistrature and exiled, and Piero was more the absolute ruler than ever (1466).

Several of the exiles appealed to Venice for assistance. The Serenissima, displeased with the Medici, because under them Florence had changed her alliance with Venice for one with Milan, allowed its *condottiero*, Bartolomeo Colleoni, to enter into the service of the exiles,



to whom it also gave money. The exiles likewise employed Ercole d'Este and other *condottieri*, and in May 1467 they entered Romagna, marching in the direction of Florence. On the Florentine side were the Duke Galeazzo Maria Sforza and the King of Naples. An indecisive battle was fought at Molinella (July 1467); in April 1468 peace was concluded, the Medici being left undisturbed in Florence. After this the Medicean party was completely victorious in Florence; all its adversaries (Capponi, Strozzi, Pitti, Soderini) were persecuted, exiled, or executed. Piero—under whom Florence had acquired Sarzana—died in September 1469, and was succeeded by his sons Lorenzo and Giuliano, proclaimed “princes of the State” in an assembly of notables.

Francesco Sforza, who died on 8 March 1466, was far more unfortunate than Cosimo in respect of his successor. His son Galeazzo Maria (1466–1476) was dissolute and tyrannical. His exorbitant expenditure left him in financial straits, so that he oppressed the people with burdensome taxation. Above all, his capricious cruelty made him hateful to the public. Genoa, where he had begun to build fortifications, the better to hold the city in subjection, rebelled against his rule, but the rising was suppressed (June 1476). In Milan two young men of good family, Gerolamo Olgiati and Gian Andrea Lampugnani, moved by the classic passion of hatred for tyrants inspired in their hearts by the humanistic teacher, Nicolò Montano, and actuated also by personal resentment, conspired with Carlo Visconti, who had likewise personal reasons for hating the duke, and stabbed Galeazzo Maria to death in the church of San Stefano (26 December 1476). Lampugnani was killed immediately; Olgiati and Visconti, discovered some days later, were executed. The people did not rise in support of the assassins, and there was no disturbance when the murdered man's son, Gian Galeazzo, was proclaimed his successor. Since he was still a minor, his mother, Bona of Savoy, sister of Amedeo IX, acted as regent, with the assistance of the Secretary of State, Cicco (Francesco) Simonetta, who had formerly been in the service of the late duke; whose brothers, and more especially Ludovico il Moro, agitated against the regency.

§ 78. THE CONSPIRACY OF THE PAZZI, THE WAR WITH FERRARA, AND THE CONSPIRACY OF THE BARONS.—After

the death of Pope Paul II (1464-1471)—a Venetian Barbo, who had succeeded to Pius II—other complications were caused by the nepotistic policy of the new Pope, Sixtus IV (1471-1484); a Della Rovere, who was born near Savona, in modest circumstances, and became General of the Franciscan Order. After the usual fruitless attempts to organize the Crusade, he devoted himself entirely to Italian politics. Two of his nephews, Pietro Riario, then twenty-five years of age, and Giuliano della Rovere, who was twenty-eight, were made cardinals; Pietro died very shortly, after a life of dishonourable magnificence (1474); Giuliano acquired six bishoprics and numerous abbeys, as well as other minor benefices. A third nephew, a layman, Gerolamo Riario, received Imola in fief and married Caterina Sforza, the natural daughter of Galeazzo Maria; another, Giovanni della Rovere, was created vicar of Sinigaglia and married the daughter of Federico di Montefeltro, who from 1474 was Duke of Urbino. Lorenzo de' Medici found various ways of opposing the territorial policy of Pope Sixtus, which he regarded as dangerous to Florence. The office of bankers to the Holy See was therefore withdrawn from the Medici and given to the Pazzi, who hailed from Valdarno: one of the richest families in Florence, and hostile to the Medici. The Medici had consolidated their dominion in Florence, and rendered it more arbitrary, by means of the *balie*. A fresh cause of dispute between Sixtus IV and the Medici was the Pope's nomination of Francesco Salviati as Archbishop of Pisa. He too was hostile to the Medici, and his appointment was not recognized in Florence.

And so two opposing groups were formed: Sixtus IV, with Gerolamo Riario, Ferrante, and Siena, against Florence, Venice and Milan. Gerolamo endeavoured to persuade the Pope that the Medici would have to be killed, and the Pope himself declared that they ought to be expelled from Florence, hoping that when they had gone the city would fall into his hands. Between Riario and the Pazzi a conspiracy was devised (the conspiracy of the Pazzi), in which Salviati and others were concerned, and on the 26 April 1478 Lorenzo and Giuliano were set upon in the Duomo at the elevation of the Host. Giuliano was stabbed to death; Lorenzo, slightly wounded, escaped into the sacristy. At the same time Salviati made an unsuccessful

attempt to take possession of the Palazzo della Signoria. The people rose to the cry of "Palle, palle!" (the Medici coat of arms), and massacred the conspirators; Archbishop Salviati was hanged from one of the palace windows. Bloody acts of vengeance and repression followed the unsuccessful attempt, which left Lorenzo more than ever the absolute ruler of Florence. Sixtus IV protested against the violation of the ecclesiastical immunity in the case of the archbishop and other members of the clergy. He excommunicated Florence and laid the Papal interdict on the city; and there was war between the two leagues. It was interrupted by the peace concluded between Lorenzo and King Ferrante (6 March 1480), when Lorenzo went to Naples in person. A contributory factor to the conclusion of this peace was the danger that René of Lorraine, the son of a daughter of René of Anjou, might resume the Angevin attempts upon the kingdom. The Turkish peril (sack of Otranto, § 76) induced Sixtus also to make peace in December.

One of the results of this war as far as Milan was concerned was the loss of Genoa, incited by Ferdinand to reconquer its liberty (1478). Ferdinand also intrigued with Il Moro and his brother the Duke of Bari against the Duchess of Milan and Simonetta. The two Sforza invaded the duchy, but then Il Moro, on the death of his brother, to whom he succeeded in the Duchy of Bari, was reconciled with the duchess, and returned to Milan. Simonetta was then arrested, and Ludovico assumed his office (1479). Simonetta was sentenced to death, and the duchess, deprived of the regency, left Milan, while Ludovico became the guardian of the duke and the governor of the State (1480).

Gerolamo Riario, frustrated in his designs upon Florence, succeeded in taking possession of Forlè at the end of 1480, and he devised certain plans to be put in force against the King of Naples, of which his uncle the Pope approved, as he was angry with Ferrante. The two of them entered into an agreement with the Venetians, promising them Ferrara, whose duke was on bad terms with the Pope, while Venice also was at odds with him, mainly for commercial reasons. There was yet another war (1482), in which Genoa and Siena supported Venice and the Pope, while Duke Ercole I of Ferrara and the King of Naples, his father-in-law, found allies in Milan and Florence. The war was fought mainly in Latium, invaded by the Neapolitans under the crown prince

Alfonso, Duke of Calabria. The Neapolitans found allies in the Colonna, while the Orsini were on the best of terms with Riario and opposed to the King of Naples, whose feudatories they were. In August 1482 the Duke of Calabria was defeated in the Pontine marshes by the Papal troops; but the death from malaria of their commander, Roberto Malatesta, prevented them from reaping the fruits of their victory. Sixtus IV then persuaded himself that any further aggrandizement of Venice would be detrimental to the Holy See, and in December 1482 he concluded peace. The Venetians continued the war against Ferrara; and while the Duke of Calabria invaded their territory their fleet attacked the Neapolitan coast and captured Gallipoli. By the peace of Bagnolo (August 1484) they restored Gallipoli, but retained the Polesine di Rovigo, and obtained other concessions from Ferrara.

Under Sixtus IV's successor, Innocent VIII (1484-1492)—a Cibo from Genoa—"nepotism" was exercised for the benefit of the pontiff's natural sons, the favourite being Franceschetto Cibo. Innocent intervened in the internal affairs of the kingdom of Naples, where the conflict was continuing between the barons, intent upon preserving their feudal privileges, and the royal power, which Ferrante and his son Alfonso, Duke of Calabria, who was especially hated, were seeking to reinforce. The repeated appeals to the Angevins, inciting them against the Aragonese, were simply manifestations of this spirit of resistance. The discontent with the government was aggravated by heavy taxation and fiscal monopolies. Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere, who had been the chief elector of Innocent VIII, and who was friendly to France and the Angevins, incited the Pope to enter into a league with the *signori* of the kingdom, who, led by Antonio Sanseverino, Prince of Salerno, had formed a conspiracy known as "the conspiracy of the Barons." Apart from their alliance with the Pope, they had an understanding with Genoa and Venice. The league turned to René of Lorraine (see above). Florence and Venice were once more allied with Naples against their plans of political upheaval (1485).

The Duke of Calabria proceeded to invade the Papal State, this time in alliance with the Orsini against the Colonna. The Pope, hard pressed by the royal forces, and the king, fearing the return of René and the French, were soon induced to conclude peace (August 1486) by which

the king pledged himself to the payment of the feudal tribute to the Pope (which had been discontinued under Sixtus IV), and to pardon the barons. Ferrante, however, did not keep his promises, and prepared to exterminate the hostile barons, one after another. The Pope, having failed to gain anything for his son Franceschetto, made friends with Lorenzo de' Medici, married Franceschetto to Lorenzo's daughter Maddalena, and gave the cardinal's hat to Lorenzo's sixteen-year-old son, Giovanni.

Lorenzo de' Medici, who was known as the Magnificent, now endeavoured to maintain peace between the great Italian principalities on the basis of the balance of power and preservation of the *statu quo*. The spinal cord of the system, which was intended also to prevent the intrusion of foreigners, was the agreement between Milan, Florence, and Naples; but Lorenzo, having won over the Pope to this alliance, was anxious to do the same with the Venetians, whom he distrusted by reason of their egoistic policy of aggrandizement. He failed, however; and there was a fresh quarrel between the Pope and Ferrante, so that Innocent proclaimed the king's deposition (September 1489). But as the Pope had received no help from the King of France, there was no real war, and another reconciliation followed, the Pope recognizing Alfonso's rights of succession to the throne (June 1492).

§ 79. CULTURE AND SPIRIT OF THE RENAISSANCE.—The isolation of the State from the people, which came to a head in the 15th century in Italy, corresponded with a divorce between culture and social life. The traditional values of the Italian Middle Ages in their phase of civic magnificence, religion, and patriotism, were subjected to invasion by religious and political crises. Side by side with the old ideals, which were not repudiated, but were no longer intimately experienced, and no longer active as of old, there entered into the upper strata of culture the ideal of individual development, liberated from the fetters of tradition, and the pursuit of letters and of the sciences as an end in itself. Inherent in this spiritual movement was a critical sense which attacked the traditional beliefs and authorities of the Middle Ages, and their very conception of life, finding its inspiration and its aliment in the revived cult of antiquity.

As a matter of fact, this cult had never entirely disappeared, least of all in Italy; but the Middle Ages, in their study of antiquity, had transformed it by assimilating it to their own peculiar spirit, which was informed by the religious, social, and political—but above all by the religious—characteristics of the period. But now men began to contemplate the works of classic antiquity for their own sake, with a mind set free and independent of the doctrines and traditions of mediaeval authority; and it is in this new spirit that the more profound significance of the Renaissance will be sought, the factor which effected the dissolution of mediaeval culture and the emergence of modern civilization. But it is true that in addition to this change of spirit there was also, in this period, a very notable increase—we may call it a quantitative increase—in the knowledge of the classic writers. It is this increased knowledge that is most properly described as Humanism. It busied itself mainly with the examination of codices, in emendations and critical editions of texts. A great many classic authors were then for the first time restored to the light: as were various works by Cicero, Plautus, Lucretius, Statius and Quintilian. The precursor of Humanism was Petrarch (§ 63); his work was continued by other Tuscans: Coluccio Salutati (1331–1406), Chancellor of the Florentine Republic; Poggio Bracciolini (1380–1459), Papal Secretary; Leonardo Bruni (1369–1444); Lorenzo Valla (1405–1457), a Roman; and Francesco Filelfo (1398–1481). The revival of Greek scholarship resulted in enormous progress as compared with the Middle Ages; and here again the influence of Byzantine culture made itself felt, for the masters of Byzantine scholarship came from the East to the Western world, especially on the occasion of the union of the Churches in 1439, and after the capture of Constantinople. Famous among these scholars were Gemistus, known as Pletho, Cardinal Bessarione, one of the most authoritative workers for the union, Demetrius Calcondila, and Constantine Lascaris. Many of them held public professorships of Greek in the Italian cities, and there were distinguished Italian scholars who continued their work, such as Marsilius Ficinus (1433–1499) and Mirandola (1463–1494). Literature is the specific sphere of Humanism. In addition to studying the works of the ancient writers, the Humanists produced works of their own, which gave birth to a new literature,

classic in form and content, whose Latin was no longer the Latin of the Middle Ages, transformed by common use, but was in intention, at all events, the true Latin of the good old times. Solicitude as to form is a special characteristic of humanistic literature, as of Renaissance letters in general, and it was often exercised to the detriment of the matter, which was ill suited to the style, or of slight consistency.

The humanists attempted all or nearly all the classic forms of literature; the epic, the amorous elegy, the lyric, the epigram, the oration, the epistle, the philosophical or moral treatise, history, biography, autobiography. We will mention only Filelfo, author of the *Sforziad*, in which he celebrated, with the venal adulation characteristic of the humanists, the achievements of Sforza and other *signori*; Antonio Beccadelli, known as Il Panormita (1394–1471), author of a famous collection of epigrams, *Hermaphroditus*; Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini (Pius II), whose orations were far less important and original than his personal reminiscences or *Commentaria*; Poggio Bracciolini, who wrote moral treatises; Bruni, the author of a *Historia florentina*, and Flavio Biondo of Forlì (1392–1463), whose *Decades* are a history of the Middle Ages, in which the Middle Ages are conceived as a distinct epoch of history; a work remarkable for its critical sense. Lastly, the historical, philosophical, philological, and above all, the poetical works of Giovanni or Gioviano Pontano, an Umbrian who lived at the court of Naples (1436–1503), and sang, with true poetical feeling, of familiar things: the delights of love, the beauties of Nature.

In Italy the literature of the vulgar tongue was abandoned by the learned for Latin letters. Nevertheless, poetry was making a new beginning in the Petrarchan lyric, varied towards the close of the century by the almost 17th-century artificiality and strangeness of the Ferrarese Tebaldeo (*d.* 1537) and Serafino Aquilano (*d.* 1500); in the bizarre comic verse of the Florentine Burchiello (*d.* 1449); and in the development of the *Sacra rappresentazione*. Of truly original poets we may mention Lorenzo the Magnificent, who gave literary form to popular motives, and above all Angelo Politian (1454–1494), a supreme Humanist, who, in his *Stanze*, a poem in octaves of exquisite grace, was the prime creator of the Italian poetry of the Renaissance. Among prose writers who followed the traditions of the 14th century were the

Florentine Feo Belcari (*d.* 1484), author of a *Vita del Beato Giovanni Colombini*, Vespasiano da Bisticci (*d.* 1498), in the *Vite di uomini illustri*, and Masuccio of Salerno in his *Novellino* (1476); while a prose which was based upon classic models was produced by Leonardo Bruni (lives of Dante and Petrarch, orations, etc.), Leon Battista Alberti (1404–1472: *Della Famiglia*), and above all, the Neapolitan Jacopo Sannazzaro (1458–1530), who in his *Arcadia*, written during the second half of the century, produced a pastoral romance of a kind already attempted by Boccaccio in his *Ameto*, while in the interpolated eclogues he set an example which the 16th century often imitated.

The greatest achievement of 15th-century literature was the poem of chivalry, which with Pulci was raised from the popular level to the status of poetry. It was at the court of Lorenzo the Magnificent that Luigi Pulci (1432–1484) wrote his *Morgante maggiore*, infusing a generous comic element into the chivalrous substance of the poem; while Matteo Maria Boiardo, Conte di Scandiano (1441–1494), in his *Orlando innamorato*, completed the fusion of Breton material with the Carolingian cycle, making love the principal motive of the feats of his Frankish paladins. The *Orlando* was a work of great significance in respect of its influence on the chivalrous poetry of Italy.

The Italian Renaissance expressed itself no less vigorously in the field of art, which, however, was more closely bound up with the religious and social life of the age than the literature.

Sculpture, inspired by the study of the antique, but instilled with new life and originality, acquired an extraordinary power of naturalistic expression in the wonderful achievements of Jacopo della Quercia (1374–1438), Lorenzo Ghiberti (1378–1455), the creator of the famous doors of the Baptistry in Florence, Donatello (1384–1466), and his disciples Andrea Verrocchio (1435–1488) and Antonio Pollaiuolo (1429–1498). Donatello's monument of Gattamelata in Padua, and Verrocchio's of Colleoni in Venice are the two masterpieces of the equestrian statuary of the Renaissance. A delicate grace distinguishes the work—for the most part applied to funerary monuments—of Desiderio di Settignano (1428–1464), and Mino da Fiesole (1430–1484), while a greater architectural dignity characterizes the monumental sculpture of the two brothers Bernardo (1409–1464) and



Antonio (1427-1478) Rossellino. The three Della Robbia (of whom Luca was the greatest) won fame by their bas-reliefs in glazed and polychrome terra-cotta.

In painting, while Fra Angelico of Fiesole (1387-1455), with his ideal Madonnas, and Benozzo Gozzoli (1420-1498) his pupil, in the ingenuous narrations of his frescoes, were still akin to the spirit of the Trecento, the new naturalistic art was initiated by Masaccio (1401-1428), an extremely vigorous painter, and continued by Andrea del Castagno (1423-1457), Piero della Francesca (1416-1492), whose work is distinguished by spatial harmonies, depth of perspective, and geometrical form, Verrocchio, Antonio Pollaiuolo, and Domenico Ghirlandaio (1449-1494). Filippo Lippi (1406-1469) and his son Filippino tempered this strength with poetic feeling, while Sandro Botticelli (c. 1449-1510), with his restless, melancholy, poignant expressiveness, was a painter of the greatest originality.

In architecture more than in the other arts the Italy of the Renaissance, breaking with the mediaeval forms, revived the motives and elements of classic art (the round arch, the architrave), assimilating and revivifying them in original forms of construction which were at once light and massive, fresh and full of life. The new architecture found expression in Florence in the Palazzo Riccardi (c. 1440), the work of Michelozzo Michelozzi, and the Palazzo Strozzi, the work of Benedetto da Maiano and Il Cronaca, and in the magnificent cupola with which Filippo Brunelleschi (1377-1440) crowned the cathedral of Santa Maria del Fiore. Other memorable works of Brunelleschi's in Florence are the Old Sacristy of San Lorenzo, the chapel of the Pazzi, and the church of Santo Spirito. Leon Battista Alberti (1404-1472) was more austere classic; poet, philosopher, musician and writer on architecture, he built the Tempio Malatestiano in Rimini, a typical construction, which partakes more of the pagan temple than of the Christian church. His also is the church of Sant'Andrea in Mantua, which has a single nave with barrel roof and lateral chapels; it may be regarded as a precursor of the churches of the late 16th century and of Baroque art.

All the artists hitherto named belonged to the school of Florence and were Tuscan by birth. But by the second half of the 15th century Italian art was flourishing in all the various regions of Italy, sometimes

as a local development, sometimes as a derivation from Tuscany. An unknown Tuscan architect was responsible for the two magnificent palaces built in Rome at the close of the century: the Palazzo di Venezia and the Palazzo della Cancelleria. Both are simple, robust and dignified; but the first exhibits certain Gothic elements, and has the look of a castle or fortress. The façades of Sant'Agostino and Santa Maria, dating from the same period, are likewise the work of Tuscan architects. In Umbria a disciple of Alberti's, Agostino di Duccio, emulated the "romanity" of the master in Porta San Pietro, Perugia, while the façade of San Bernadino reveals him as an exquisite decorator. An architect of great distinction was the Dalmatian Luciano Laurana (1420–1479), the builder of the ducal palace of Urbino, and possibly the designer of the triumphal arch of Alfonso of Aragon in Castelnuovo di Napoli.

In Lombardy and Venetia the architecture of the 15th century was still largely Gothic. In Milan, also—as we know (§ 68), through the initiative of Gian Galeazzo Visconti—rose the most Gothic edifice ever seen in Italy, the Duomo. But in the Ospedale Maggiore, begun half a century later for Francesco Sforza by the Florentine Filarete (1400–1469), the Renaissance was already asserting itself under the Gothic forms. Another Florentine, Michelozzo (see above), built the Portinari chapel in Sant' Eustorgio, in which the Renaissance features are still more conspicuous. A Lombard, Giovanni Antonio Amadeo, built the Colleoni chapel at Bergamo, a work of pure Renaissance architecture, and the exuberant façade of the Certosa di Pavia (§ 68), in which Gothic and Renaissance elements are intermingled.

In Venice, in the 15th century, the façade of the wonderful Palazzo Ducale, fronting upon the Piazzetta, is Gothic in style, as is the Porta della Carta; the work of Giovanni Bon and his son Bartolomeo. On the other hand, another Venetian, Antonio Rizzo, adopted Renaissance forms in the cortile of the same palace, but without the feeling for construction which was the soul of the new style; and the purely decorative character prevails also in the very graceful church of Santa Maria dei Miracoli, the work of the Lombardo family of sculptors and architects, and in the Procuratorie Vecchie, which is possibly the work of the same artists; and also in certain of the 15th-century palaces on

the Grand Canal (the most beautiful of these being the Palazzo Vendramin-Calergi).

In the Venetian sculpture of the 15th century the Bons, father and son, with archaic grace, fused the elements of Gothic art with those of the Tuscan Renaissance. An original artist, both robust and graceful, was Antonio Rizzo, whose Adam and Eve are in the cortile of the Ducal Palace. In the architectural sculpture of funerary monuments, besides the Tuscan artists already mentioned, who did a great deal of work elsewhere, the Lombard Andrea Bregno must be mentioned, whose work is well represented in Rome (sometimes in association with that of Mino da Fiesole), as is that of the Venetians—Rizzo and the Lombardo family—in the churches of Venice, especially in the Frari and Santi Giovanni e Paolo.

But it is above all in the painting of the 15th century that we find, besides the Florentine school (and the Sienese, which survived in the archaic forms of the previous century), a rich variety of schools in the various regions of Italy, and also certain non-Florentine artists of national importance. Such are Gentile da Fabriano (*d.* 1428) and the Veronese Pisanello (*d.* after 1450), in whose work elements of Gothic linearity are combined with a naturalistic tendency and a robustness which are purely Renaissance characteristics. Such is Antonello da Messina (*c.* 1430–1479), who, after assimilating the qualities of Flemish art, came under the influence of Piero della Francesca (see above), developing an art characterized by volume and perspective.

Between Tuscany and Umbria was Luca Signorelli of Cortona (1441–1523), a disciple of Piero della Francesca, who diverged from the art of his master in his dramatic treatment of his subjects, as did Melozzo da Forlì (1438–1494), whose figures are full of movement. The Umbrian school, in the second half of the century, was distinguished by the grace and depth of feeling which we find in the work of Benedetto Bonfigli and Fiorenzo di Lorenzo, and this school attained national importance with Pinturicchio (1454–1513), and above all, with Pietro Perugino (1445–1523), among whose disciples was Raphael.

In Venetia painting underwent varied and important developments. Padua, with the *bottega* of Il Squarcione, was a centre of the painter's art; here painting was subject to the influences of Gentile da Fabriano

and Antonello da Messina, and of the Florentine school itself. The Byzantine tradition, which in Venice had been more full of vitality than elsewhere, having been outlived, two dynasties of painters emerged—the Vivarini and the Bellini. The Bellini, more advanced than the Vivarini, produced one of the greatest personalities of Italian art in Giovanni Bellini (1430–1516), beside whom we must name his brother Gentile Bellini (1429–1507), Vittor Carpaccio (flourished *c.* 1500), and Cima da Conegliano (*c.* 1459–*c.* 1517). The influence of the Paduan school was felt in Emilia, where the school of Ferrara produced three great painters: Cosmè Tura (*c.* 1430–1495), Francesco del Cossa (1435–1480), and Ercole di Roberti (*c.* 1430–1496); and in Lombardy, of whose painters we must mention Vincenzo Foppa (*c.* 1427–*c.* 1516) and Bergognone (flourished *c.* 1500).

Quite apart from humanistic scholarship and learning, and the transformation of literature and art, the Renaissance acted as a ferment in every department of thought: in religion, philosophy, science, morality and politics. The fundamental character of its action in these directions was the liberation and secularization of the intellect. The religious spirit and the moral sense of the men of the Renaissance were very different from the traditional and Catholic religious spirit and morality. Their minds were set, not on the doctrines of the Church, but on the culture of antiquity; not on life beyond the tomb, but on this earthly life, which was a thing to be enjoyed, and employed as a means of asserting one's own personality, with the proud self-awareness and the desire for glory which are characteristic of the Humanists.

The scholastic philosophy, now in the stage of decadence, which had enlisted the philosophy of the ancients in the service of the Catholic faith, was supplanted by the direct study, considered as an end in itself, of the ancient writers, and above all of Plato and Aristotle; and from this study there emerged a school of philosophic thought which was far freer and bolder than the old, and nourished by the rationalistic spirit, which was often regardless of dogma, and sometimes even attacked it. Thus, Pietro Pomponazzi (1462–1525), a professor at Padua and elsewhere, derided the immortality of the soul as a philosopher, though he accepted the belief in immortality as an article of religion, in accordance with the doctrine of the twofold truth, in which there was a relic

of the Middle Ages. Marsilius Ficinus, on the other hand, the translator of Plato, and the author of a Platonico-Christian system of philosophy, was the leader of a Florentine group of Platonists, or rather of neo-Platonists (*Accademia platonica*), which respected and professed the Christian beliefs, but revived and remoulded them by personal speculation. Somewhat akin to him was Pico della Mirandola, a man of stupendous learning, a student of Arabic and Jewish philosophy (the Kabbala), as well as the classic philosophers, who aimed at a vast synthesis of the Christian doctrines and the various philosophies, and whose orthodoxy was held in suspicion. In science also new tendencies were revealing themselves, and the study of the laws of Nature—which had hitherto been studied, for the most part, with fantastic results—was revived and continued by Bacon, Copernicus and Galileo.

The study of politics and of the State of antiquity increased the hostility felt for the political power and the privileges of the clergy and the other mediaeval classes, and also for the tendency of the State to assume absolute power, and to regard its own good as the one supreme aim, even when this was in conflict with traditional morality. Thus, Lorenzo Valla vehemently assailed the domination of the priests and the Papacy, "the cause of all Italy's misfortunes"; and he subjected their claims to historical criticism, demonstrating the spuriousness of the Donation of Constantine. The Renaissance, and in particular Humanism, are often represented as irreligious; but this is not correct; nor does the distinction between a pagan Humanism and a Christian Humanism correspond with the reality. None of the Humanists repudiated the Christian religion, whether in practice or theory; and even the elements of criticism and dissent in respect of the traditional religion—and such criticism and dissent were very general—did not of necessity imply irreligion, but rather the need of a new religion, more intimate and more personal. Side by side with its rationalistic tendency the Renaissance—as we see clearly in the case of Ficinus and Pico—reveals a mysticism which led even to theosophical and astrological speculations. But this tendency did not give rise to a movement of religious renewal: the people remained completely unaffected by it.

For Italy Humanism and the Renaissance signified a period of spiritual predominance, with regard to the rest of Europe, following

upon a period of economic predominance. By the second half of the 15th century the scholarship of the Humanists and the cult of antiquity were already becoming diffused in Germany, France and England, introduced by transplanted Italian professors, or by natives of these countries who had studied in Italy. Most noteworthy among these were Nicholas Cusanus (di Cues), who became a cardinal (1401–1464), a philosopher and an immature scientist; Johann Reuchlin (1455–1522), an able Grecian and Hebraist; and the Dutchman, Erasmus of Rotterdam (1466–1536), author of the *Adagi*, of the *Moriae encomium* ("In Praise of Folly," a famous satire), and of the first critical edition of the New Testament (the Greek version); a man who freely and bitterly criticized the contemporary state of the Church, but who was none the less deeply religious, a Christian who had examined his faith in a liberal and critical spirit. Contemporary with these scholars were the Frenchman Jacques Lefèvre of Etaples (1455–1536) or Faber Stapulensis, and the Englishmen Colet and Thomas More.

The full influence of the Italian Renaissance did not make itself felt in the vernacular literatures until about the middle of the 16th century. However, we see the first signs of this influence in the work of the Frenchman Philippe de Commynes (*d.* 1511), who in his *Mémoires* tells, with shrewd political understanding, the history of his own times; while half a century earlier Geoffrey Chaucer (*d.* 1400), in his *Canterbury Tales*, was to some extent an imitator of Boccaccio. The influence of Italy was felt even later by ultramontane art (apart from Flemish painting, which underwent a renaissance contemporaneous with the Italian, or even a little earlier), for this retained its purely mediaeval characteristics until well on into the 16th century, especially in the sphere of architecture and "Flemish Gothic."

A part of capital importance in the diffusion of the new culture was played by the printing-press, one of the great innovations of the Renaissance epoch. From about the year 1462 the invention of moveable type, originating in the workshop of Johannes Gutenberg (*d.* 1468) in Maintz, spread throughout Europe. In 1477 Caxton opened his press in England. But Italy was the second country to employ the printing-press; there were soon presses in Subiaco (1465), Rome, Venice, Milan, Florence and other cities. About 1500 Venice became the chief centre

of the new art, and the most famous of the Venetian publishing houses was that of Aldo Manuzio (*d.* 1515), which was distinguished for the beauty of its type, the handy format in 8vo, which was more convenient than in folio, and the accuracy of its Greek and Latin texts, collated from the codices by a specially recruited academy of Humanists. By 1500 there were already a thousand printers and more than thirty thousand printed books, to which the name of "incunabula" has been applied, signifying that they represent the infancy of the printer's art.

Before the introduction of printing, since manuscripts were rare and costly, culture could not become diffused, but remained of necessity the patrimony of the few. Now, however, the printing-press furnished a rapid and economical means for the diffusion of culture, the progress of science, and the propaganda of ideas. Like the new culture of the Renaissance, the Reformation found its most effective auxiliary in the printing-press.

#### § 80. ECONOMIC CONDITIONS. GEOGRAPHICAL DISCOVERIES.

—In the 15th century Italy was less predominant in the economic sphere than during the preceding centuries, for the other nations had developed their own economy, and in particular their industries; but she was still in a very flourishing condition, and these very developments abroad contributed to feed Italian commerce, so that trade with France, Spain and Germany was more active than ever. Florence, in the course of the 15th century, no longer compelled to make use of the Genoese fleet for trading in the Western Mediterranean, created a powerful mercantile marine, fostered by protectionist measures, which penetrated even into the Levant, replacing to some extent the Genoese and Venetians. Within the Italian frontiers the formation of the great states favoured the development of commerce, abolishing local barriers or restricting their number.

The Florentine and Milanese wool industry lost its predominant position in Europe owing to the competition of English woollens, which were coarser, but cheaper; but it still flourished in many small centres, and the Florentines adapted themselves to the new method of manufacture. But the silk industry, on the other hand, was more flourishing than ever—since the courts and the foreign notabilities

were consumers of the finer qualities—in Milan, Genoa and Florence.

While the Italian industry of the 15th century presented certain symptoms of decadence, agriculture was definitely on the up-grade. A great deal of the capital accumulated in the industries, or no longer absorbed by them, was invested in agriculture. Fresh soil was cultivated, fresh areas were deforested, and above all more cereals were grown. The cultivation of cereals was favoured by extensive irrigation works, especially in Lombardy (Naviglio della Martesana, Canale della Maura) and in Piedmont. Intensive agriculture was also developed, and improved methods were adopted. The extensive cultivation of forage crops made it possible to raise more cattle. There was also intensive cultivation of industrial crops, such as the mulberry (to feed silkworms), flax, and hemp.

At the close of the 15th century Italy was enjoying an extraordinary economic prosperity, probably greater than that of any other part of Europe. Two factors co-operated in changing this state of affairs: political events, and the great geographical discoveries—in which, however, Italy played a most important part, and which contributed to the movement of spiritual emancipation, for by revealing the existence of new countries it struck a heavy blow at traditional science.

The Norsemen had penetrated as far as Greenland, and from Greenland they had sailed to Labrador, but of their voyages only vague and uncertain memories had survived, and these were confused with the many legends relating to the isles of the Atlantic Ocean. Not until very much later—in the 13th and 14th centuries—were such voyages of exploration repeated, by Italians amongst others, and the successive discoveries of the Canaries, the Azores, and the Cape Verde islands seemed to provide a basis for the legends which told of lands even farther to the West. However, the voyages that led to the great discoveries of lands unknown were due not so much to scientific curiosity as to the need experienced by the peoples of Western Europe to find new ways of reaching the Indies, thereby evading the monopoly which the Italians were exercising in respect of trade with the East. The first to attempt to realize this plan were the Portuguese, who in the course of the 15th century penetrated as far as the Azores, the Cape Verde islands, the coast of Senegal, and the coast of Guinea. In 1486 Barto-



lomeo Diaz rounded the terminal point of Africa, which he called the Cape of Tempests, a name afterwards changed for that of the Cape of Good Hope. This pointed the way to Vasco da Gama, who, sailing for India in June 1497, touched at various points of the eastern coast of Africa, and landed on the coast of Malabar in 1498.

But already a solution of the problem of reaching the Indies had been attempted which was to lead to the discovery of a new continent. Paolo del Pozzo Toscanelli, the illustrious Florentine physicist (*d.* 1482), starting from the concept of the sphericity of the earth, and of the great extension of Asia towards the East, had gone so far as to insist that the Indies might be reached by sailing to the West. Christopher Columbus accepted this theory and sought to prove its reality. A Genoese by birth, after many years of study and navigation he appealed in vain to Portugal for the means of carrying out his plan. He then proceeded to Spain, and after some years of endeavour, and some difficult moments, he succeeded in persuading King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella (§ 81) (April 1492) to accept his proposals and conditions. With three caravels, the *Santa Maria*, the *Pinta*, and the *Nina*, he sailed on the 3 August 1492 from the port of Palos, steering westwards, as he said, to "buscar el levante per el ponente." On the 12 October he landed on a small island in the Bahamas—perhaps Guanahani—which he called San Salvador. Sailing on, in order to discover what he believed to be the Asiatic continent, he came to Cuba and Haiti (Juana and Española). In March 1493 he returned to Palos, where he was welcomed with great enthusiasm.

On his second voyage (1493–1496) Columbus discovered other islands, and on the third (1498–1500) he reached the mainland (the coasts of Venezuela and Colombia). During this voyage he fell into disgrace, having shown himself incapable of organizing the new territories. He was replaced by Francesco di Bobabilla, who sent him back to Spain a prisoner, thereby exceeding the instructions given him by his sovereigns, who, in their regret for what had happened, gave fresh proofs of their good will towards Columbus by providing him with the means of making a fourth voyage, on the condition that he was to confine his activities to the discovery of new countries. On this voyage (1502–1504) the great navigator reached the coast of Honduras and turned southwards, looking for a strait which would lead him

farther west, until he came to the isthmus of Darien. On the whole, this expedition was unsuccessful, and Columbus, on his return, found himself overlooked and discarded. Weary and old before his time, he died two years later at Valladolid (20 May 1506).

Meanwhile, amidst increasing enthusiasm, discovery followed upon discovery.

Even during the lifetime of Columbus other countries had been discovered; thus, in 1499 the Spaniard Giovanni de la Cosa and the Italian Amerigo Vespucci had reconnoitred the coast of Venezuela ("Little Venice"). In 1513 Vasco Nuñez di Balboa crossed the isthmus of Darien, reaching the shores of the Pacific.

The greater part of these voyages of discovery were made with the object of finding the passage to the Indies through the newly discovered lands. Meanwhile, however, the letters in which Amerigo Vespucci had narrated his adventures had become known to the scholars, and in one of these, published in 1507, he described under the name of the New World a very extensive territory which in the south-west barred the route to the Indies. It was this, perhaps, that gave the German geographer Waldsee-Müller the notion of giving the country whose existence had been announced the name of America. This name, which was at first reserved for the great country lying to the south-west, was afterwards extended to the northern territories, when it had been shown that both constituted a single continent.

Discovery was followed by colonization, and in this way Spain built up an immense colonial dominion, from which, however, she did not by any means derive the increased power which might have been expected. The Spaniards, in the course of their conquests, encountered not only savage peoples, but also flourishing empires and peoples in a very advanced stage of civilization. Between 1519 and 1526 Fernando Cortez conquered Mexico, overthrowing the empire of the Aztecs; Francisco Pizarro and other adventurers invaded Peru, destroying the empire of the Incas (1526-1532), and conquering Chile. During this period of conquest and discovery Ferdinando Magalhaes (Magellan), a Portuguese in the service of Spain, made the first attempt to circumnavigate the globe, passing through the strait to which he gave his name from the Atlantic to the Pacific. He died during the

voyage, after reaching the Philippines, which he discovered (1519–1522); but his ships completed the round voyage.

The Portuguese, who had anticipated the Spaniards, continued to emulate them in the ardour of discovery and the extent of their conquests. In America they possessed themselves of Brazil (discovered by Cabral in 1500), in Asia, of Ormuz (1508), at the entrance to the Persian Gulf, and in India of Goa (1510); they also took Minorca, becoming the masters of the keys of the Indian Ocean. They then reconnoitred the great Sunda Islands (where they established factories), the Philippines, and the Moluccas, and penetrated as far as Japan.

France and England followed the example of the two Iberian states. John Cabot, a Genoese who had become a Venetian, and had entered the service of England, discovered Labrador and Hudson Bay (1497); his son Sebastian afterwards explored the North-East passage by which it was hoped to reach India. Another Italian, in the service of France, Giovanni di Verazzano, discovered the Gulf of St. Lawrence; the course of the river was explored by Jacques Cartier, who discovered Canada (1535–1536). But at the time there was no great colonizing movement on the part of the French and English.

The great discoveries, besides hastening the liberation of the intellect from the bonds of mediæval culture, provoked a true revolution in the economic sphere. The products of the farthest East were henceforth imported by sea, so that the countries bathed by the Mediterranean were no longer the commercial centre of Europe, but those countries which fronted the Atlantic, and especially Portugal. The precious metals which were obtained from the conquered territories made money abundant, and facilitated great accumulations of capital, while on the other hand they led to the devaluation of landed property. Then followed a further decline of the feudal nobility, whose wealth consisted more especially of land, and the decadence of those states in which this class was still predominant, while the wealth and the political importance of the states increased which contained a numerous industrious and commercial middle class, able to derive wealth and power from the new countries. The displacement of the commercial centre of Europe from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic was ruinous to Italy, who had hitherto exercised a commercial monopoly.

## CHAPTER XIII

### *THE FOREIGN INVASIONS*

§ 81. ITALY AND THE GREAT POWERS.—At the close of the 15th century the greater part of modern France and nearly all Spain were grouped each in a single state under a strong monarchical power. Thanks to the financial means which their sovereigns had at their disposal they were able to provide themselves, by the system of mercenary recruiting still in force, with large and well-equipped armies. There had been remarkable changes of military organization. The infantry had become the most important arm, and in the infantry the “Swiss system” had proved superior to any other; that is, the system practised by the militias of the various states of the Helvetic Confederation; and the neighbouring powers competed for the opportunity of enrolling them as mercenaries, so that the concession or refusal of troops by the states of the Confederation was a political affair of great importance. The “Swiss system” subjected the foot-soldiers to a uniform discipline and armed them with a long spear, which made their squadrons equally formidable in attack or defence. Those countries were therefore the strongest in a military sense which were able to procure a regular supply of Swiss mercenaries (as France had done), or who—as Spain did later—had succeeded in introducing the new tactics in their own infantry.

A revolution of capital importance in the art of war—though it came about very gradually—was the introduction of firearms. Gunpowder became generally known to the Western peoples from the 13th century onwards, though it seems that there must have been some knowledge of it very much earlier. The first firearms made their appearance in the 14th century; they were of little real value, and were awkward to manage, but they were gradually improved, though they were not in general use until the 16th century. The regular armies which had been created, especially in the great Western states,

by replacing the feudal and communal militias with mercenary foot-soldiers and small but picked bodies of cavalry, adopted the firearm, and the feudal and communal forces lost all significance, so that the political power of the feudal nobility was still further diminished.

The preparation and mobilization in the field of a great army thus became a business that only a great state could undertake. Portable firearms were as yet of subordinate importance, and the same may be said of the field artillery. On the other hand, the heavy artillery employed in attacking fortresses was already remarkably efficacious, and this only a wealthy government could afford to procure. The French were especially strong in siege artillery.

Unlike France and Spain, Italy was divided into five great states and a number of lesser ones. Among the great states even Venice could hardly be regarded as a Great Power; and Venice was precisely that one of the states which pursued a most egoistical policy. The successive leagues and pacts between the Italian states had given rise to nothing stable, had never proved really efficient. Moreover, as we have seen, the foreigner was already established in parts of Italy, and other parts he could easily enter. By the beginning of the second half of the 15th century there were many who already foresaw the possibility of a French intervention in Italy. And now, towards the end of the century, a new power had arisen, for Spain was united under the wedded sovereigns, Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabella of Castile.

The destiny of Italy was now essentially dependent upon the direction which might be followed by the general policy of the two great Western powers. Spain might have found a wide field of activity in Africa, but the possession of Sicily made it almost impossible for her to remain indifferent to the destinies of Italy, especially if another Great Power should set foot there. As far as France was concerned, Charles VIII should have had enough to occupy him in completing the territorial unity of the realm within its natural frontiers; and he should have found his chief natural adversary in the Habsburgs, the heirs of the Duke of Burgundy. On the contrary: he restored Franche Comté and Artois to Maximilian I and his son Philip, and Rousillon and Cerdaña, territories beyond the Pyrenees, to Ferdinand of Aragon,

and he was even reconciled with England. All this in order that he might have his hands free to deal with Italy, whither he felt drawn not only by his designs upon Naples, but also by vague dreams of empire, the Crusade, and Eastern conquest.

Political conditions in Italy were worsened by the death of Lorenzo de' Medici (8 April 1492). His successor in the hegemony over Florence was his son Piero, as greatly inferior to his father as his grandfather Piero had been inferior to his great-grandfather Cosimo; while the government of Florence still remained indefinite in character, a republic in theory and a principality in fact, but shaken by the ferment of political and moral opposition (Savonarola: § 82). Lorenzo's death was followed not long afterwards (25 July 1492) by that of Innocent VIII, who, as we have seen, was in conflict with Lorenzo. His successor, who received the vote of the majority of the cardinals, was Rodrigo Borgia, the nephew of Calixtus III (§ 77), who took the name of Alexander VI (1494-1503). He was a capable politician—as politicians went in those days—but ill-bred, avid of wealth and pleasure, and engrossed in advancing the fortunes of his illegitimate children, Caesar, Giovanni, Jofré, and Lucrezia, whose mother was Vanozza de Cattaneis, a Roman woman. Caesar was created Archbishop of Valencia and a cardinal: Giovanni was already Duke of Gandia in Spain: Jofré was married to a natural daughter of the Duke of Calabria, where he received as dowry the principality of Squillace: and Lucrezia married Giovanni Sforza, lord of Pesaro, a nephew of Ludovico il Moro.

§ 82. CHARLES VIII IN ITALY. GEROLAMO SAVONAROLA.—A policy of unbridled nepotism, like that of Alexander VI, introduced an element of uncertainty into Italian affairs. A state of tension arose between Ludovico il Moro and King Ferrante, owing to the fact that when a legitimate daughter of the Duke of Calabria, Isabella, married Duke Gian Galeazzo, Ferrante wished the latter to assume the effective government of the duchy, which was still held by his uncle Ludovico. As he feared the King of Naples, it was with great anxiety that Ludovico realized that Piero de' Medici was a close ally of Ferrante. He endeavoured to counterbalance this alliance by enter-

ing into a league (April 1493) with Venice and the Pope; but the league was rendered insecure by the vacillating relations between the Pope and Ferrante. For that matter, before he joined the league Il Moro had entered into a much more perilous understanding with France. Renewing an old treaty of alliance (January 1492), he assured Charles VIII of his neutrality if the king should invade the Kingdom of Naples, and he even incited him to invade the country. So did Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere, who hoped the invasion would lead to the deposition of Alexander VI, with whom he had broken entirely; and the Florentine envoy, Pier Capponi, who was plotting behind the Medici's back to bring about his fall; and above all, the Neapolitan barons who were living as exiles in France. Il Moro, however, before Charles VIII had made a move, began to hesitate, and attempted to place obstacles in the way of the expedition, and to discover reasons for delay. Amidst these threats of war King Ferdinand I of Naples died (28 January) and was succeeded by his son Alfonso II (1494-1495), who as Duke of Calabria was greatly hated by the feudal nobles. Pope Alexander invested him with the kingdom and concluded an alliance with him.

At the end of August 1494 Charles VIII entered Piedmont without difficulty, proceeded to Asti, and was welcomed as a friend by Ludovico il Moro in Pavia, the young duke being also present. But the latter died soon afterwards (22 October), and Il Moro, who was perhaps responsible for his death, immediately had himself acknowledged as Duke of Milan, receiving the investiture from the Emperor Maximilian regardless of the claims of the late duke's son. Meanwhile the French army made a victorious progress along the Ligurian Riviera and through Romagna, and entered Tuscany. Piero de' Medici, Fivizzano having been taken by the French, went to meet Charles, when he agreed to deliver to him the fortresses on the frontier (Sarzana, etc.), Pisa, and Leghorn, and to make him an annual payment of 200,000 florins. On learning the terms of this humiliating peace the Florentines drove out the Medici (9 November 1494), and set up a provisional government, and when Charles entered Florence they refused to accept the terms which he attempted to impose upon them. Pier Capponi, one of those who were deputed to negotiate with the

king, tore up the treaty, uttering the famous defiance: "We shall ring our bells." The king moderated his demands for money and promised to restore the fortresses. From Florence he proceeded to Siena, and from Siena he made his way into the Papal State. Alexander VI consented to his entering Rome, which he did on the evening of St. Sylvester's day, 1494, while the Pope shut himself up in the Vatican, and then in Castel Sant'Angelo. A group of cardinals, first among whom was Giuliano della Rovere, insisted to the king that a council should be convoked which would depose the Pope as elected by means of simony. But Charles VIII preferred to enter into negotiations with Alexander, who granted the king free passage, various sureties in the Papal State, and hostages. Alfonso meanwhile, realizing that he was hated by his subjects, abdicated in favour of his son Ferdinand II, known as Ferrandino (1495-1496), who failed to check the invasion, owing to the military preponderance of the French and the outbreak of rebellion in the Neapolitan kingdom and army. He therefore took refuge, with his family, on the island of Ischia, and afterwards in Messina.

On the 22 February 1495, Charles VIII made his solemn entry into Naples, but he did not obtain the investiture of the kingdom from Alexander VI. On the 31 March a "Holy League" was concluded in Venice between Ludovico, the Venetians, the Pope, Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, and the Emperor. Thus the destinies of Italy were beginning to be the object of the policies of the great non-Italian powers. Charles VIII, fearing that he might be cut off from France, hastily turned back (May). The forces of the league, commanded by Francesco II Gonzaga, Marquis of Mantua, attempted to bar the way. In the valley of the Taro, at Fornovo, on the 6 July 1495, the two armies met; the battle was long and indecisive, but the French army was able to continue its retreat, and to reach Asti in safety, by way of Piacenza and Tortona. The confederates, instead of following it, laid siege to Novara, which had been seized by the Duke of Orleans. Ludovico, in order to recover the city, broke away from the league, concluding a treaty on his own account with Charles VIII, who a few days later recrossed the Alps (October 1495). Meanwhile Ferdinand II, assisted by the Spanish forces under the command of the celebrated



Gonzalo de Cordoba, defeated the French troops and re-entered Naples (July), while the Venetians seized the Adriatic ports of the kingdom. The Aragonese recovered the kingdom as easily as they had lost it. In October 1496 Ferdinand II died without leaving direct heirs, and was succeeded by his uncle Frederick (1496-1501).

Of the Italian powers, Florence had been no party to the "Holy League," remaining loyal to the French alliance. The chief preoccupation of the Republic was to recapture Pisa, which, after the French occupation, had liberated itself from Florence, being supported in its resistance by the Venetians. Charles VIII's behaviour in respect of Pisan affairs was highly ambiguous, but a factor contributing to the permanence of the Florentine alliance, apart from the Francophile tradition, was the belief that he was an instrument of God by which the Church was to be chastised and then reformed; a belief which was diffused by the fiery sermons of a Dominican friar, Gerolamo Savonarola, on the corruption of the age and the necessary renovation of Christianity. Savonarola, born at Ferrara in 1452, had been living for many years in the Dominican convent of San Marco in Florence, which he had made the centre for a reform of the Order in Tuscany. He had predicted the coming of Charles when it was still in doubt, and his success, and the fall of the Medici: and by this, and the sanctity of his life, and the religious force of his eloquence, he had gained a tremendous reputation as a prophet of God, and was called upon to direct the political life of the city.

After the expulsion of the Medici two tendencies were apparent in respect of the new constitution of the State: the oligarchical and the democratic. Savonarola resolutely upheld the principle of popular sovereignty, but he tempered its application in practice. In December 1494 a Grand Council was instituted, composed of citizens over twenty-nine years of age whose forebears had held one of the three chief offices in the republic (prior, *gonfaloniere*, member of the Council). This body elected eighty citizens over forty years of age, who constituted a council corresponding to the Venetian Senate. Still in obedience to Savonarola's suggestions, an attempt was made to solve the financial problem by the imposition of a 10 per cent land tax, while usury was attacked by the institution of a Monte di Pietà. Fra

Gerolamo, taking advantage of the dictatorial power thus acquired, endeavoured to realize his religious and moral ideals, and to bring about the triumph of religion and purity of morals in public and private life: not without a vigorous system of supervision which even led to acts of violence and espionage. Typical manifestations of this theocratic government were Fra Gerolamo's proclamation, amidst popular enthusiasm, of Christ as King of Florence, and the Carnival processions which culminated in the burning of "vanities" (women's articles of toilet, frivolous and immoral books and pictures, etc.) in the Piazza della Signoria.

Savonarola, in his sermons, censured the Roman Curia itself, and the conduct of Alexander VI, expressing himself with the utmost freedom. Alexander requested him to moderate his language, and summoned him to Rome, that he might justify himself, and forbade him to preach. Savonarola obeyed neither the invitation nor the prohibition. But in Florence itself his popularity was not undisputed; for the party of the Piagnoni, who were devoted to him, was presently opposed by the parties of the Arrabbiati, which were oligarchical and hostile to the Medici, the Compagnacci, who believed in enjoying life, and the Bigi or Palleschi, partisans of the Medici, who were then by no means numerous. The Papal excommunication (13 May 1497) strengthened the hands of his enemies. Savonarola took no heed of the excommunication, declaring that it was invalid. Rome threatened to impose the interdict; a *signoria* of Arrabbiati took over the government, and forbade Savonarola to continue his preaching. He now called for the convocation of a Council which should depose the Pope as "simoniacal, heretical and infidel." A Franciscan (it must be remembered that the rivalry of the Franciscans and Dominicans was traditional) challenged him to pass through fire, as he had on other occasions asserted that he had the power of doing. Savonarola having refused the challenge, a follower of his, Fra Domenico Buonvicini, offered to accept the ordeal in his place. The accuser delegated another Franciscan. The Signoria consented, and great preparations were made, but on various pretexts the ordeal was abandoned (7 April 1498). This gave the advantage to the friar's enemies, so that the Signoria commanded him to go into exile; and as it seemed that he had no

intention of obeying the order his enemies made an attack upon the convent of San Marco, where, after a brief resistance, he was taken prisoner, together with Fra Domenico Buonvicini and Fra Silvestro Maruffi. In his trial, the final phase of which was conducted by two Papal commissaries, torture was employed *à outrance*, while the documents were falsified in order to prove that Savonarola had confessed to being an impostor. Sentenced to death, the three friars were hanged on a cross in the Piazza della Signoria, and then burned (23 May 1498).

§ 83. LOUIS XII AND THE BORGIA. MILAN TO FRANCE, NAPLES TO SPAIN.—Charles VIII having died without offspring at the early age of 28 (April 1498), he was succeeded by his cousin Louis de Valois-Orléans—Louis XII (1498–1515)—who immediately revealed the nature of his ambitions by assuming the title of King of the Two Sicilies and Duke of Milan, claiming the Milanese as the descendant of Valentina Visconti (§ 68, 74). He succeeded in liquidating the Holy League by entering into an understanding with Spain, Venice, and the Pope. Caesar Borgia—who abandoned his ecclesiastical status after his brother the Duke of Gandia had been assassinated (probably by Caesar himself)—received from the king the Duchy of Valentinois (Valenza, Valentino, whence his name of Duke Valentino) and the hand of Charlotte d'Albret, sister of the King of Navarre, and a promise of help in the creation of a state after France had conquered the Milanese.

Louis entered into a league with Venice by the terms of which he was to cede Cremona and the left bank of the Adda (the Ghiaradadda) to the Venetians.

Ludovico il Moro was now without allies, for his only friend, Frederick of Naples, was in no position to help him, so he proceeded to incite the Turks against Venice, and in the autumn of 1499 they did actually make an incursion into Friuli. The French, assembling at Asti early in August, took Alessandria and Pavia without encountering resistance, while the Venetians advanced victoriously to Lodi. The duke fled to Germany, and the citadel of Milan capitulated (September); Cremona also was occupied by the Venetians. On the

6 October 1499 Louis XII made his solemn entry into Milan, where all the Italian princes gathered to do homage to him; among them being the King of Naples. Then, leaving Trivulzio in Milan as governor, he returned to France.

The partiality of the new governor, the taxes which he imposed, and the arrogance of the French soldiers, excited general discontent, so that Ludovico, summoning up his courage and hiring Swiss troops, re-entered Milan on the 5 January 1500, drove the French across the Ticino, and reoccupied Novara. But the King of France immediately sent help and hired other Swiss troops, who induced their fellow-countrymen in the service of Il Moro to betray him. Ludovico was surrendered to the French, who reoccupied the duchy (April 1500), and was sent to France a prisoner, and there he died in 1508. Louis XII, however, had to cede the country of Bellinzona to the Swiss cantons.

In order to gain possession of Naples, Louis entered into negotiations with the other pretender, Ferdinand the Catholic. By the treaty of Granada (November 1500) the kingdom was divided: Louis XII took Naples and the Abruzzi and Ferdinand Apulia and Calabria. He also entered into an agreement with the Pope with regard to this partition (June 1501). In the spring of 1501 the French marched into the Napoletano; King Frederick, disregarding the treaty, himself admitted the Spaniards to the fortresses of Apulia in order to obtain their help; then, his ally having learned of his treachery, he withdrew to Ischia, and surrendered the kingdom to Louis XII, obtaining in compensation the Duchy of Anjou, with a pension for life (September).

Meanwhile Duke Valentino, with his French auxiliaries, prepared to invade Romagna. The Pope declared that the *signori* of Romagna and the Marches were divested of their fiefs, on the pretext that they had not paid the tribute owing to the Church. His son was to overthrow them. In December 1499 Valentino occupied Imola and Forlì, which was stoutly defended by Caterina Sforza, the widow of Geronimo Riario (§ 78). Appointed *gonfaloniere* of the Church, he used the funds which the Pope had procured by creating twelve cardinals in return for money payments to hire fresh troops, and on recom-

mening the campaign he took Pesaro, Rimini, and then Faenza, which was stubbornly defended by the sixteen-year-old Astorre Manfredi, who surrendered on honourable terms (April 1501), but was then thrown into Castel Sant'Angelo and done to death. Having completed the conquest of Romagna, Caesar was created its duke. The work of repressing the petty *signori* and restoring public order was carried out with ruthless severity by the governor whom Caesar had left in Romagna; so that the new duke, considering that the task had been sufficiently accomplished, and desiring that the governor should be held solely responsible for the detestable measures adopted, had him also put to death. The conquest of Romagna completed, Caesar Borgia decided to extend his dominion into Tuscany, at the expense of Siena—then under the *signoria* of Pandolfo Petrucci—and the principality of Piombino, ruled by Jacopo d'Appiano, and he even adopted a hostile attitude toward Florence. But he then came to terms with the Florentines, who withdrew their protection from Appiano, and the whole principality of Piombino, including Elba, was occupied by the ducal forces (summer of 1501). Florence, the better to assure herself against Valentino, entered into negotiations with the King of France (April 1502). But before this the Borgias and Duke Ercole of Ferrara entered into a close matrimonial alliance. Lucrezia's first marriage, with Sforza, had been dissolved; the second, with Alfonso di Bisceglie, natural son of Alfonso II of Naples, ended with the assassination of the husband at the instance of Caesar Borgia. Now Lucrezia married Alfonso d'Este, son of Duke Ercole (September 1501).

In the summer of 1502 Caesar Borgia, by means of treachery, deprived Guidobaldo di Montefeltro of his duchy of Urbino, took Camerino from Giulio Cesare Varano, causing him and his two sons to be strangled, and through his *condottiero* Vitellozzo Vitelli robbed the Florentines of Arezzo, Cortona and San Sepolcro. Here the King of France intervened, compelling him to restore these latter to Florence; but then Valentino met the king in Milan (August 1502) and managed to renew and reinforce his understanding with him, obtaining a free hand against the Bentivoglio, lords of Bologna, who had formerly been protected by France. At this juncture the duke's *condottieri*, most of whom were petty lords of Central Italy, realized

that by helping him they were paving the way to their own ruin. Foregathering at the Magione, near Perugia, they came to an understanding with the Bentivoglio, Petrucci, and Duke Guidobaldo. The rebellion suddenly flared up in the duchy of Urbino and at Camerino, which were reoccupied by their *signori*; Borgia's troops were defeated, and for a moment it seemed that his star was about to set. But he shut himself up in Imola, obtained auxiliaries from Louis XII, negotiated with Florence, came to terms with Bentivoglio and the *condottieri*, reoccupied the lost territories, made an appointment with the *condottieri* at Sinigaglia, and then, when they were in his power (31 December 1502), he had them put to death (Vitellozzo Vitelli, Oliverotto da Fermo, Paolo and Francesco Orsini). When this became known the other petty tyrants of Central Italy fled; Città di Castello and Perugia were occupied. In Rome Alexander VI, on hearing what had been successfully accomplished at Sinigaglia, had the aged Cardinal Orsini arrested. He died some days later, possibly by poison. The Orsini fled to escape massacre, entered into a league with the Savelli, and fortified themselves in the Castella del Patrimonio. The duke's forces advanced victoriously into Latium, committing unheard-of atrocities. The Orsini were compelled to accept an armistice. Caesar was now considering the possibility of making himself the master of Tuscany. The financial means for this venture were obtained by poisoning the very wealthy Cardinal Michiel and creating a number of cardinals in return for heavy payments.

Meanwhile France and Spain had gone to war with each other over a question of the frontier dividing the Napoletano (June 1502). Gonzalo was compelled to shut himself up in Barletta, where Louis of Armagnac, Duke of Nemours, laid siege to him. With the Spaniards were many Italians, fighting under the banners of Prospero and Fabrizio Colonna. Certain Frenchmen who had been taken prisoner aspersed Italian valour; and the Italians issuing a challenge, a combat was arranged between thirteen champions of each nationality. It took place on the 13 February 1503 in the presence of the two armies, and ended in the victory of the Italians, who took the Frenchmen prisoner. This feat, celebrated as the "Challenge of Barletta," discouraged the French. A body of French troops was defeated at

Seminara (28 April 1503) by an army of Spanish auxiliaries, and Gonzalo, making a sally from Barletta, fell upon the French at Cerignola (28 April). The Frenchmen were absolutely defeated, and the Duke of Nemours was left dead on the field. On the 14 May the Spaniards entered Naples.

Alexander VI and Caesar now began to break away from France. But on 18 August 1503 the Pope died after a brief illness. It is probable that malaria, and not poison, was the cause of his death. Caesar, who was also stricken with illness, was not in a condition to control events.

While the Conclave was electing a Piccolomini, Pius III, an old and sickly man, the *signori* of Central Italy were recovering their dominions; Romagna alone remained quiet for the time being. Twenty-seven days after his election Pius III died, and Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere was chosen as his successor (Julius II, 1503–1513). In order to secure the Papacy he had made extensive promises to Valentino, which he did not keep. The Borgia's possessions in Romagna were confiscated by the new pontiff.

Meanwhile a French army of reinforcement was descending towards the Garigliano. For some months the French and Spanish forces were encamped upon the two opposite banks of the river, watching each other; but on the 29 December 1503 Gonzalo crossed the river and attacked the French, who were dispersed. During their flight Piero de' Medici, who was following the French army, was drowned in the Garigliano. On the 1 January 1504 a truce was concluded between France and Spain; this was followed in 1505 by a treaty in accordance with which Ferdinand the Catholic, the widower of Isabella, married Germaine de Foix, niece of the King of France, who brought him as her dowry that part of the Napoletano allotted to France by the previous agreement. Gonzalo proceeded to restore order in the Napoletano, which was not united with Sicily, but, like the latter, was governed by a separate viceroy.

Gonzalo wrote *finis* to the career of Caesar Borgia, who had sought refuge in Naples, by sending him to Spain as a prisoner. However, he succeeded in escaping from prison, when he took refuge with the King of Navarre. In 1507 he was killed in a skirmish with a rebel under the walls of the fortress of Viana.

§ 84. THE LEAGUE OF CAMBRAI.—Foreign intervention had now profoundly transformed the internal equilibrium of Italy. Two Italian states, Naples and Milan, had ceased to exist as such; Florence was exhausting herself in the war with Pisa, which was not ended by the victory of Campiglia (1505), won against the army which the Venetians had sent in aid of Pisa, nor yet by the training of the communal militia as recommended by Nicolò Machiavelli. It was during this period that the office of *gonfaloniere* was for the first time conferred for life, the first to hold it under the new conditions being Pier Soderini.

The only strong and independent state surviving in Italy was Venice. But since she was intent solely upon enlarging her Italian dominions, without any regard for the destinies of the peninsula as a whole, she was regarded, in Italy and abroad, with increasing envy and resentment. Julius II—who had resumed, without any nepotistic aims, the policy of creating a strong Papal dominion, abolishing in 1506 the *signorie* of the Baglioni in Perugia and the Bentivoglio in Bologna—was exasperated by the Venetian occupation of territories in Romagna. He therefore favoured agreements between France and the Empire to the detriment of the Venetians.

In 1508 the Emperor Maximilian, acting without allies, made war upon Venice, for the republic had refused to let him pass when he wished to descend into the peninsula in order to assume the imperial crown in Rome and assert his rights over Milan. The Venetian commander Bartolomeo d'Alviano defeated him, and advancing through Friuli, occupied Pordenone, Gorizia, Trieste and Fiume, forcing the Emperor to conclude a truce. On the 10 December 1508 Maximilian and Louis XII concluded at Cambrai a league against Venice, indicating as the promoter of the alliance, Julius II, who officially joined the league in 1509, and in April excommunicated the republic. Spain, England, Hungary, Savoy, Ferrara, Mantua and Florence also joined the league. The treaty contemplated the completed partition of the Venetian state on the mainland, and included the Emperor's promise to France of the investiture of Milan. Florence, by disbursing money to France and Spain, obtained an undertaking from the two powers that they would not intervene further in the war with Pisa, which



capitulated in June 1509. Thus everything was subordinated to the concentration of force against Venice. The republic did not recoil from the formidable coalition, but in a few months it was brought to the verge of ruin. The Venetian army sent against the French was defeated (14 May 1509) at Aguadello in the Ghiaradadda, and within a few days the enemy had occupied the whole of Venetian Lombardy, while the Papal forces recovered the lost territories in Romagna, the Duke of Ferrara the Polesine di Rovigo, the Marquis of Mantua Lonato, and Maximilian the territories lost the previous year, while the Spaniards attacked Trani in Apulia. The malcontents in the Veneto rose against the government of the republic, and Verona, Vicenza and Padua raised the standards of the Empire.

The Venetians renounced their possessions in Romagna and the Napoletano in favour of the Pope and the King of Spain, and the two sovereigns now showed themselves inclined to effect a reconciliation with the republic. Hostilities were concentrated upon the Emperor, who had entered the Veneto. The Venetians recaptured Padua, defeated the Marquis of Mantua, Gian Francesco Gonzaga, taking him prisoner, and compelled Maximilian to raise the siege of Padua; and a little later they recovered Vicenza, Belluno and Friuli. They also reoccupied the Polesine, despite the Duke of Ferrara, but on the Polesella the ducal artillery dispersed the Venetian fleet sent up the Po to support the army against the Ferrarese (22 December 1509).

Julius II, having obtained from Venice liberty of trade and navigation in the Adriatic, and full respect for ecclesiastical immunities in Venetian dominions, became completely reconciled with the republic, and absolved it from the Papal censures (24 February 1510). He then entered into an anti-French alliance with Venice and Spain, conceding to Spain the investiture of Naples; and since the Duke of Ferrara still sided with the French, he considered that the opportunity had arrived for depriving him of the duchy and incorporating it in the State of the Church. The duke having been excommunicated, the Papal army occupied Modena (autumn of 1510) and Mirandola (January 1511); the Pope himself directing the siege of Mirandola and making a victorious entry through the breach. But the French came to the rescue under the aged Gian Giacomo Trivulzio, took Bologna

(May 1511) and recaptured Mirandola. There was fighting also in the territory of the Church. To the censures launched by Julius II against the Duke of Ferrara and his allies, Louis XII replied by convoking a national synod, which declared itself in his favour, and called for an Oecumenical Council (1510). A group of cardinals, at the instance of the Empire and of France, took it upon themselves to convoke such a Council, which in 1511 opened its sessions in Pisa, but almost immediately transferred itself to Milan. Julius II then convoked in his turn a General Council in Lateran (where it assembled in May 1512), declared an interdict on Pisa and Florence, and in conjunction with Venice and Spain organized a "Holy League" against France, crying "Away with the barbarians!" (5 October 1511), and he fully expected that the Swiss troops which he had enlisted would give him the victory. Before the Swiss had arrived the young and able French generalissimo, Gaston de Foix, reoccupied Brescia and Bergamo, which had rebelled—operations which were accompanied by terrible slaughter—after which he pursued the army of the League and defeated it in the battle of Ravenna (11 April 1512), the most bloody engagement which had been fought in Italy for a very long period, and in which he himself was killed. The French army, lacking reinforcements, was inferior in numbers to that of the League, which included Swiss and Venetian troops. Consequently the Milanese and the city of Milan itself (June 1512) were lost to France, and Maximilian (Massimiliano) Sforza, son of Ludovico il Moro, was proclaimed Duke of Milan. Parma and Piacenza were ceded to the Pope, and the Swiss took possession of Locarno and the Valtellina. The anti-Papal Council of Milan took refuge in Lyons, where nothing came of its activities; Maximilian broke with France, concluding an armistice with the Venetians; Genoa likewise liberated herself from foreign rule. Florence having refused to adhere to the League, the latter now sent an army against the Florentines, which captured Prato and committed a horrible massacre. The Medici re-entered Florence in August 1512, whereupon the Soderini went into exile, leaving the government in the hands of Cardinal Giovanni de' Medici.

On the death of Julius II (21 February 1513) Giovanni de' Medici was elected as his successor, taking the name of Leo X (1513–1521).

The French made an attempt to recover their position, entering into an agreement with Venice. A new French army crossed the Alps, while the Venetians entered Lombardy. But the Swiss troops of Maximilian Sforza completely routed the French at Novara (6 June 1513), and immediately invaded French territory; and the Venetians, who were forced to evacuate Lombardy, suffered a crushing defeat on the Olmo near Vicenza (October 1513). Moreover, the English, who since December 1511 had been in alliance with Spain, defeated the French at Guinegate in Flanders, in the so-called Battle of the Spurs (August 1513).

Louis XII, however, succeeded in effecting a reconciliation with the Pope, formally repudiating the Council of Lyons. He also made peace with England, and concluded a truce with Spain. On his death, on the 1 January 1515, he was succeeded by his cousin and son-in-law Francis I of Valois-Angoulême (1515-1547), who made preparations for recovering the Milanese; whereupon the Swiss, the Emperor, the Pope and Spain allied themselves in defence of Maximilian Sforza. An army occupied the passes of the Piedmontese Alps; but Francis I succeeded in making his way over the Argentera, which was held to be impracticable, and by circumventing the Swiss he entered Milanese territory. At Melegnano, between Milan and Lodi, the Milanese forces attacked him. A desperate battle ensued: it continued for two days (13-14 September 1515); the Swiss gave proof of extraordinary valour, but at last, attacked by the Venetian cavalry and inundated by the waters of the Lambro, whose dykes Trivulzio had pierced, they retreated in good order.

The result of the battle was decisive. Maximilian Sforza ceded the duchy to Francis I in exchange for a pension; Spain, the Swiss, and the Emperor Maximilian in succession concluded peace with Francis; the Emperor resigned the territories which were still in the hands of the Venetians, who recovered the whole of their possessions on the mainland. But the first to be reconciled with Francis was the Pope, who restored Parma and Piacenza to the duchy of Milan, and further pledged himself to restore Modena and Reggio to the Duke of Ferrara.

Leo X promoted the interests of his house by declaring Francesco Maria della Rovere, who had succeeded to his uncle and adoptive

father, Guidobaldo di Montefeltro, divested of the duchy of Urbino, and investing as its duke—after its conquest—Lorenzo de' Medici, son of his brother Piero (1516). Francesco Maria, after an attempt at recovering the duchy, ceded it to the pontiff. Lorenzo, however, died soon afterwards (1519), and Leo united the duchy to the State of the Church, while the government of Florence was taken over by Cardinal Giulio, son of that Giuliano who was assassinated at the time of the conspiracy of the Pazzi.

During the war in Urbino a group of cardinals who had various grievances against Leo X hatched a conspiracy against him. The head of the conspiracy was Cardinal Alfonso Petrucci, one of whose brothers had been expelled from his *signoria* of Siena with the aid of the Pope, and replaced by a cousin who was devoted to the Medici. The conspiracy was discovered, and Petrucci, who had plotted the death of the Pope, was strangled (1517). Three years later the lord of Perugia, Gian Paolo Baglioni, who had already submitted to the Pope, was imprisoned in Rome by a trick, and put to death as guilty of various crimes, whereupon Perugia was made directly subject to the Holy See. Various petty tyrants of the Marches were also dispossessed.

§ 85. FRANCIS I AND CHARLES V. THE SUBJECTION OF ITALY TO THE EMPEROR.—Peace between France and Spain (Treaty of Noyon, 13 August 1516) was concluded by the new Spanish sovereign, Charles I of Habsburg. Born in 1500, he was the son of Philip—himself the son of the Emperor Maximilian and Marie, daughter of Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy—and Joanna the Mad, daughter of Ferdinand of Aragon and Isabella of Castile. Thus, from his paternal grandfather he had inherited the extensive Burgundian dominions—Franche Comté, Artois, and the Low Countries, the latter being roughly equivalent to modern Belgium and Holland; and from his mother the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon—that is, Spain—of which he became actually possessed on the death of his maternal grandfather Ferdinand (January 1516). This accumulation of territories, extending from the north of Europe to the south, was the outcome of those perspicacious Habsburg marriages, which gave rise to the motto: “Arma gerant alii, tu, felix Austria, nube.”

On the death of his paternal grandfather, the Emperor Maximilian I (January 1519), Charles inherited the Austrian possessions of the Habsburgs—which in 1522 he ceded to his younger brother Ferdinand, who afterwards, as the result of other marriages, became King of Hungary and Bohemia—and he was also elected as successor to the Empire (28 June 1519) under the name of Charles V (1519–1556). Francis I, King of France, had vainly aspired to the imperial crown, and henceforth he was the rival of the Habsburg monarch. Francis looked for allies in the name of European equilibrium, and first of all to the Pope; but Charles V, by promising Parma and Piacenza to Leo X, was able to win him over, and he also entered into an understanding with England. The power of France, the greatest unitary state in Europe, seemed to many the most dangerous of all.

Francis I opened the war in 1521—in Italy, the Low Countries, and Navarre—but without success. A Spanish-German army conquered Lombardy. On the morrow of this victory (1 December) Leo X died; Francesco Maria della Rovere recovered his duchy of Urbino and the Baglioni returned to Perugia. Leo's successor was the Cardinal of Tortosa, Adrian of Utrecht, a Dutchman who had formerly been tutor to Charles V, and who now took the name of Hadrian VI (1522–1523). Coming to Rome from Spain, he reconfirmed Della Rovere in the duchy of Urbino, and, unlike Leo X, he devoted himself entirely to the reform of the Church; he was not a patron of letters and the arts, and he introduced the most parsimonious methods into the administration of the Church. He was consequently hated by the Roman court and the world of Humanism, and—partly by reason of the brevity of his pontificate and his inexperience—his good intentions were barren of results. He maintained the alliance with the Empire, as did his successor, Giulio di Medici—Clement VII (1523–1534)—under whom the Curia returned to its previous policy.

In the spring of 1522 the Swiss in the service of France attacked the imperial army, commanded by Prospero Colonna, at Bicocca, near Milan; but the German *landsknecht* and the Spanish footsoldier showed that they had rivalled and even surpassed the Swiss system of attack and defence, and here they were victorious. Genoa too was again recovered from France, and Francesco II Sforza, the brother

of Maximilian, became Duke of Milan. Even Venice, normally the ally of France, made terms with the Emperor (July 1523). A little later Charles of Bourbon, a powerful prince of the blood royal, betrayed his king, Francis I, by going over, with other French nobles, to the side of the Emperor. Succeeding Colonna in the command of the imperial forces, he drove the French out of Italy—it was during this retreat that the famous Bayard, “le chevalier sans peur et sans reproche,” was slain—and he then invaded Provence (spring and summer of 1524), but was compelled to withdraw.

Francis I then entered Italy by the Mont Cenis pass and reoccupied Milan (October 1524). The imperial troops assembled in Pavia, which was besieged by the French. After a siege of four months a relieving army arrived, and a pitched battle was fought (Battle of Pavia, 24 February 1525), with disastrous results for the French. Francis himself was taken prisoner.

The Italian states now realized that the greatest and most dangerous power in Europe was the Habsburg, and they sought *rapprochement* with France. England also made peace with France (August 1525). Negotiations followed between Venice, Sforza, the Pope, and the regent Louise of Savoy, the mother of Francis I. The attempt was made to win over the imperial commander, the Marquis of Pescara, by the promise of the crown of Naples. He made a show of consenting, but then arrested the leader of the plot, Gerolamo Morone, who was Sforza's chancellor, and compelled the duke to surrender nearly all his fortresses (October 1525). Soon after this Pescara died.

Francis I, taken as a prisoner to Spain, obtained his liberty by subscribing to the Treaty of Madrid (14 January 1526) with the onerous conditions imposed by Charles; but on returning to France he declared the treaty null and void, because extorted, and at Cognac he formed a “Holy League” against the Emperor (22 May 1526), his allies being Clement VII, Florence, Venice, and Sforza. But these allies failed to act with energy and promptitude. Francis I did not at once intervene in Italy, and the commander of the Italian allies, the Duke of Urbino, fought a desultory sort of campaign, perhaps because he distrusted the Medici. The imperialists found allies in the Colonna—who occupied Rome for a time, compelling the Pope to agree to a four months’

truce—and in Alfonso I, Duke of Ferrara; while the Tyrolese noble, Georg von Frundsberg, mustered 12,000 Lutheran *landsknechte* at his own expense, and descended into Italy to fight for the Emperor. The Duke of Urbino did not bar the passes of the Alps, but awaited the Germans in the Lombard plain, and even then confined himself to observing their movements and harrying them. In a skirmish at Governolo on the Po one of the most valiant commanders of the League was mortally wounded: Giovanni de' Medici, then in his twenty-ninth year: a member of the younger branch of the house, which was descended from Lorenzo, the brother of Cosimo the Elder. His mother was Caterina Sforza, the widow of Riario (§ 74), who had remarried. This young commander was known as Giovanni delle Bande Nere, from the strip of mourning which he had placed on his banners after the death of Leo X.

The Spanish and German forces, united under the command of the Duke of Bourbon, continued to advance, still followed by the Duke of Urbino, until they reached the walls of Rome. On the 6 May 1527 the city was taken by assault; although the Duke of Bourbon was killed, it was stormed and subjected to the worst violence; the sack of the city continued for many days. The Pope, shut up in Castel Sant'Angelo, received help neither from the Duke of Urbino nor from the allies; while in Florence the government of the Medici was once more overthrown (May 1527). There was nothing left for Clement VII to do but to capitulate, withdrawing from the League.

Only now, when the Italian resistance was already weakened, did Francis I send an army into Italy, under the command of Lautrec, who took possession of Genoa with the help of a valiant Genoese admiral in the service of France—Andrea Doria—and also of Alessandria and Pavia; after which he laid siege to Naples (April 1528), while Filippino Doria, Andrea's nephew, defeated the Spanish fleet in the Gulf of Salerno. But Andrea Doria, disgusted with Francis I, went over to the Emperor (August 1528), from whom he obtained the liberty of Genoa, which was once more taken from the French and given a new aristocratic constitution, the work of Doria. Sickness was decimating Lautrec's forces; he himself died in August 1528, and his army was forced to capitulate. A new French general was

defeated at Landriano, near Pavia, and the French had to withdraw from Italy.

Clement VII and Charles V concluded the Treaty of Barcelona (29 June 1529), by which the Pope promised Charles the imperial crown and the investiture of Naples; in exchange Charles was to compel the Venetians and the Duke of Ferrara to return, respectively, Cervia and Ravenna, Modena and Reggio, and he was to restore the Medici to power in Florence. Francis I also concluded the Peace of Cambrai with the Emperor (5 August 1529)—known also as the “Peace of the Ladies,” because it was urged by Louise of Savoy, Francis’s mother, and Margaret of Austria, Charles’s aunt. France renounced all rights over the Milanese (and also Asti), the Napoletano, Artois, and Flanders; Charles V did as much in respect of Burgundy.

In November 1529 Charles V proceeded to Bologna, where the Pope awaited him, and where the other Italian princes were assembled, in order to systematize the affairs of Italy. Asti was given to the Duke of Savoy, Charles III; Francesco II Sforza, in return for a great sum of money, was invested in the duchy of Milan; Venice concluded peace, undertaking to restore Ravenna and Cervia to the Pope, and the territory still occupied in the Napoletano to Charles; as for Ferrara, Modena and Reggio, all claimed by the Pope, the matter was referred to an imperial award. (This was published in the following year, and was entirely favourable to Alfonso, who was invested in Modena and Reggio as fiefs of the Empire, and in Ferrara as a fief of the Church.) On the 23 December 1529 a “perpetual league” was concluded between the Pope, the Emperor, Ferdinand King of Hungary (§ 85), Venice, Milan, and the other imperial princes. On the 22 February 1530, still in Bologna, Charles V was crowned King of Italy by Clement VII, and on the 24th he was crowned Emperor. The servitude of Italy was now complete; Florence alone retained her freedom for a time.

In Florence, after the Medicean government had again fallen, the constitution anterior to 1512 was re-established, with an annual *gonfaloniere*.

There was a recrudence in the city of the spirit of Savonarola; Christ was once more proclaimed King of Florence. The first *gon-*



*falconiere*, Nicolò Capponi, was inclined to effect a reconciliation with the Emperor and the Pope; but the extreme anti-Medicean movement was triumphant. The agreement suggested by the Pope, who asked that the Medici should return to Florence as private citizens, while the pontiff was to have a very limited share in the government, was not accepted, for the Florentines had no faith in the observance of treaties.

Florence, abandoned by all, meant to defend her liberty to the utmost; she engaged Malatesta Baglioni of Perugia as her captain, and made preparations for the defence of the city, with the aid of a distinguished engineer, Michelangelo. In October 1529 the imperialists, commanded by Philibert of Orange and the Marquis of Vasto, appeared within sight of the city, and at the end of the month they began the bombardment. To 40,000 imperialists the republic was able to oppose only 13,000 regular soldiers, widely dispersed over the dependent territories; but all the citizens flocked to the standard, and from their midst emerged a brilliant commander, Francesco Ferrucci.

In February 1530 the imperialists occupied Volterra, which Ferrucci recaptured and held against the assaults of the enemy. But in the meantime Empoli fell, and the siege became more and more rigorous, despite the frequent sorties of the besieged; memorable among which were those of the 5 May and the night of the 20 June, when it seemed that if the counter-offensive had been pushed home the imperialists would have been defeated. Baglioni, anxious to ingratiate himself with the Pope and so obtain the restitution of Perugia, did not wish Florence to be victorious, and his plan of forcing her to surrender might have succeeded had the enthusiasm of the Florentines been less. The Signoria ordered Ferrucci to collect the scattered troops and with them to attack the imperial camp, and thereby liberate the city, or at least supply it with victuals. From Volterra Ferrucci proceeded to Leghorn and Pisa, and from Pisa, by way of the county of Lucca, he reached, on the 31 July, the hills surrounding Pistoia. It seems that Malatesta Baglioni communicated the Florentine plan to Orange, and by promising that he would not make a sally against the imperialist camp, he made it possible for the imperialists to oppose Ferrucci with the greater part of their forces.

Ferrucci, on entering Gavinana, found the imperial troops before him. The Prince of Orange having fallen, they were driven off the field, but then, recovering themselves, they surrounded Ferrucci's troops, which, after fighting with the greatest valour, at last scattered and fled. Ferrucci, withdrawing to a village with a few soldiers, still continued to resist; but covered with wounds, he was forced to surrender, when he was killed by an imperialist captain, Fabrizio Maramaldo, to whom he cried: "You are murdering a dead man" (3 August 1530).

This defeat, with the death of Ferrucci, was a deadly blow to Florence. Nevertheless, when Malatesta proposed the cessation of hostilities the Signoria replied by calling the citizens to arms; but Malatesta surrendered a bastion to the enemy and turned the artillery on the city. Florence was thus compelled to surrender (12 August 1530). The Florentines readmitted the Medici and allowed the Emperor to reorganize the civic government, "while intending still to preserve their liberty."

The *balià* to which the provisional government was entrusted persecuted the enemies of the Medici and the republican party, banishing many and executing others. Nevertheless, it would willingly have preserved something of the republican institutions; but the programme of the Pope was carried. The Pope wished the absolute *signoria* to be conferred upon Alessandro de' Medici, the natural son of Lorenzo Duke of Urbino. An imperial decree proclaimed Alessandro head of the Florentine republic and hereditary duke (1531) and a subsequent session of the *balià* confirmed the title, abolishing the Signoria and the Gonfalonierato (27 April 1532).

§ 86. THE APOGEE OF THE RENAISSANCE.—This period of thirty-five years of continual wars, from the advent of Charles VIII to the fall of Florence, is that in which the civilization of the Renaissance reached its apogee in Italy. In the Cinquecento the Italian Renaissance attained its full development, and yielded its ripest fruits in the field of literature and art. The scholarly activities which characterized the Humanism of the Quattrocento were still pursued, but they now gave precedence to the production and appreciation of literature, properly so called; and at the same time the literature of the Latin

language was outstripped by that of the vernacular, which, in its great abundance, expressed the new artistic ideals and the characteristics of contemporary society. Art was cultivated by men of great individuality; there was an increasingly profound assimilation of classic tradition and a complete break with mediaeval tradition, and the art of the period gave birth to original creations, distinguished by their strength and beauty. Scientific research and speculation became more intensive and of greater value; they were beginning to shake off the blindfold suggestion of Aristotelean scholasticism, to draw their sustenance directly from the traditions of antiquity, and to strike out new paths. Science, however, had not yet acquired any really novel method or orientation, and to a great extent it still retained the character of *a priori* and fantastic speculation, rather than a discipline of positive research. In the scientific sphere the Renaissance was to produce its greatest results in the following period.

In the Cinquecento the Renaissance was still prevalently Italian; but it invaded the outer world far more rapidly than in the Quattrocento. In the sixteenth century Italy was truly the mistress and dispenser of civilization to all Europe. Her literati and her artists carried the example of their works to foreign countries and foreign courts, and the culture of the various nations, emerging from the Middle Ages and turning toward the modern world, was inspired by the impulse and shaped by the conscious imitation of what was being done in Italy. In science also Italy, though not so completely predominant, was yet conspicuously to the fore.

The characteristics to which we have alluded do not hold good for the whole of the sixteenth century, but approximately for the first fifty years. With the Peace of Cambrai (§ 88) and the Council of Trent (§ 89) a profound change manifested itself in the spiritual life of Italy; the Renaissance had come to an end, and the artistic and literary output began to decline from the excellence it had achieved. This refers to Italy; for the outer world also these dates marked a decisive point, but rather than the beginning of a decadence it was that of a full development, in which the imitation of Italian models was replaced by creative work of a more original and national character. And this progress was perceptible, as we have seen, in science also.

In Italy the Cinquecento continued the Humanistic tradition of the study of the classic literatures, above all of Latin literature, and this study was facilitated by the fact that the editions of ancient authors had been made accessible and more numerous by the new invention of the printing-press, now generally diffused. The (Aldine) editions of Aldo Manuzio (§ 79), celebrated for their typographical beauty and the critical accuracy of their texts, were continued throughout the century by his son and nephew.

Philology and scholarship, in the sphere of classic literature, which had few followers at the beginning of the century, when almost exclusive attention was given to the literary study of form, experienced a great revival about the middle of the century. The greatest Italian philologist of the Cinquecento was the Florentine Pier Vettori (1499–1585), a critic and commentator of the classic texts, whose scholarship was strictly scientific. Carlo Sigonio of Modena (1524–1584) studied the history of Rome and the Middle Ages, extending his investigations from the texts of the classic and mediaeval authors to the monumental inscriptions and official documents of the period. The scientific study of the classic languages was combined with that of the vulgar tongue (of which the first grammars and dictionaries appeared, Italian as well as Latin), following the Dantesque tradition of *De vulgare eloquentia* and repudiating in innumerable discussions the prejudice of its inferiority to Latin. This scientific activity, of which the most celebrated example is the *Prose della volgar lingua* of the Venetian Pietro Bembo (1470–1547), contributed to the definitive consolidation of the literary Italian language.

The Latin epic had a distinguished exponent in Jacopo Sannazzaro (§ 79), who wrote, in a classic style, a mythological travesty—a form then commonly employed—of the Christian legend and dogma in *De partu Virginis* (1526); while a famous example of didactic poetry, distinguished for its sinister actuality, was *Syphilis sive de morbo gallico*, by Gerolamo Fracastoro of Cremona (1483–1553). There was a most abundant and varied output of lyric and above all of elegiac poetry, and here we must mention, as true and most graceful poets, the Venetians Giovanni Cotta (*d.* 1510), Andrea Navagero (1483–1529), and Marcantonio Flaminio (1498–1550). Paolo Giovio of Como

(1483–1552) showed himself a vivid and colourful historian of his own times in *Historiae sui temporis* and other works; while Pietro Martire of Anghiera (1459–1526) wrote the first account of the discovery of America in *De rebus oceanicis et orbe novo*, and many authors wrote the history of the various European nations.

But the splendour of Latin literature was obscured by the tremendous and equally splendid output of literature in the Italian tongue. The poetry of chivalry produced its most typical work in the *Orlando furioso* of Ludovico Ariosto of Reggio (1474–1533), who lived at the court of the Este in Ferrara: a poem which in its exquisite and effortless elegance, its inexhaustible variety of narrative, its psychological insight, the plastic vitality of its descriptions, and its graceful gaiety, is the most richly flavoured of the fruits of Renaissance art, and a faithful mirror of the society of the period. Besides the poem of chivalry, nourished on the stuff of mediaeval tradition, the classic orientation of the Renaissance led to a revival of the epic poem, in which the laws and the pattern of antiquity were followed. The masterpiece of this school of poetry, which, however, owes much of its charm to the admixture of mediaeval elements, is the *Gerusalemme liberata* of Torquato Tasso (1544–1595), the great and unhappy poet whose work wrote *finis* to the Renaissance and already savoured of the Counter-Reformation and the Seicento.

Lyric poetry, which had become popular in form, and full of conceits and oddities, such as pleased the taste of the later 15th century, was restored by Pietro Bembo to the pure Petrarchian form, which gave rise, throughout the 16th century, to a copious output of poems, very largely love poems, correct in style, but for the most part cold and conventional. A certain sincerity and originality were displayed by Vittoria Colonna (1492–1547), a woman of most noble character, and a member of a princely family; Giovanni Guidiccioni of Lucca (1500–1541); and above all, a girl of Padua, Gaspara Stampa (1523–1554), and Michelangelo Buonarroti (see later), who expressed himself as vigorously in his poetry as in his art. Innovations in respect of form appear in the sonnets of the Florentine, Monsignore Giovanni della Casa (1503–1556); and new metres were introduced, in imitation of the Horatian ode, by Bernardo Tasso (1493–1569), the father of

Torquato. A true child of the Cinquecento was the satire in *terza rima*, a poem of a moral character (the principal examples are the satires written by Ariosto in imitation of Juvenal and Horace), while political and personal verse found its best expression in the *Pasquinate* of Rome and the lampoons of Pietro Aretino (1492–1555), lively and talented productions, but of a low moral tone. The satirical element is found also in the burlesque poetry of the period, the ablest exponent of which was the Tuscan Francesco Berni (1497 or 8–1535); a species of poetry which was before long produced to the point of satiety, much of it being monotonous and insipid. Didactic poetry flourished, Italian no less than Latin; in particular, the *Georgics* of Virgil were imitated, though by no means equalled, in the *Api* of Giovanni Rucellai (1475–1525) and the *Coltivazione* of Luigi Alamanni (1495–1556), both Florentine writers. A more pleasing and original poet was Luigi Tansillo of Venosa (1510–1568).

The influence of the Renaissance in the theatre was decisive. While Politian (§ 79), in his *Orfeo*, had adapted the form of the mystery play to a profane subject, the Cinquecento turned to the faithful reproduction of the Greek and Latin tragedies (Seneca) and the Latin comedy (Plautus and Terence), taking from the Latin the subjects, the intrigue, the characters, and the development, and observing the Aristotelean rules as to unity of time and action.

The first tragedy of this kind was the *Sofonisba* (1515) of Gian Giorgio Trissino of Vicenza, which was followed, throughout the Cinquecento, by a multitude of others, some deriving from Greek tragedy (Trissino, Rucellai), and some from Seneca (Giambattista Giraldi Cinzio, Sperone Speroni), but all, as a general thing, sterile imitations of the classics, without any sort of vitality. The best is the *Orazia* of Aretino, which has a certain originality and is effective drama. The classic comedy in the vulgar tongue was initiated by *La Calandria* (1513), by Bernardo Dovizi da Bibbiena; it had many exponents, in verse and prose, but here the imitation was less awkwardly faithful, and contemporary life provided many original elements. The names most worthy of mention are: Ariosto, the Florentines Antonfrancesco Grazzini (1503–1584), known as Il Lasca, and Gianmaria Cecchi (1518–1587); and above all, Aretino and Machiavelli,

la Vega, known as the Castilian Petrarch (1503-1536), and Diego de Mendoza (1503-1575).

In England, under Henry VIII, the Italianate lyric was successfully introduced by Sir Thomas Wyatt (1503-1542), who imitated Petrarch, and the Earl of Surrey (1517-1547).

The most distinguished prose of the Cinquecento was produced by the historical writers, who were the true forerunners of the modern historian; for as well as narrating the facts they sought to deduce from them, in a half experimental manner, the causes and the laws of events, and the canons of political conduct. Political science was one of the chiefest products of the Renaissance, and one of the greatest glories of the Italian Cinquecento. Its most eminent exponents were two Florentines, Nicolò Machiavelli (1469-1527) and Francesco Guicciardini (1483-1540), the one distinguished for his bold and ingenious theoretical speculations, and the other for his keen objectivity of realistic observation.

Machiavelli, in the *Discorsi sulla prima Deca di Tito Livio*, deduces political axioms from Roman history, which he confronts with contemporary happenings; and in *Il Principe* he draws an ideal portrait of the Renaissance sovereign whose only guide is his self-interest as a ruler, but at the same time he earnestly invokes Italian independence and unity; while in *Storie fiorentine* he inquires, with profound political sagacity, into the causes of the events narrated. Guicciardini, in the *Storia d'Italia* (from 1492 to 1534), comprises for the first time, in a powerful synthesis, the whole history of the peninsula, inquiring exactly into the true nature of events, and their real causes, while in other works he expounds the precepts derived from his experience of politics. These two masters of their art were followed by a worthy succession of political and historical writers.

A new kind of history, the history of art, was initiated by the *Vite dei più eccellenti pittori, scultori e architetti* of Giorgio Vasari of Arezzo (1511-1574).

More traditional in character was the very abundant output of *novelle*, drawing inspiration from the models furnished by Boccaccio, and depicting the public and private life of the period. Matteo Bandello of Castelnovo (c. 1485-c. 1560) was the greatest Italian

novelist after Boccaccio; an effective narrator, he gives a wonderful representation of his 16th-century world. We have a no less effective evocation of the society of the Renaissance in the *Cortegiano* of the Mantuan Baldassare Castiglione (1478-1529), in which he draws the ideal portrait of the Italian gentleman of the period, while the rules of courtesy are expounded by Della Casa in his *Galateo*.

In conclusion, then: the Italian literature of the Cinquecento, while on the one hand it continued and completed the mediaeval tradition in its poems of chivalry and its novels, transforming this tradition under the influence of the Renaissance, on the other hand it opened up the path to modern literature with its historical and political treatises, its comedies, and its exact scholarship.

In other countries the chief characteristic of the literature of this period is the disappearance of the old mediaeval forms and the emergence of a new literature under the guiding influence of Italian letters.

In France Clément Marot (1496 or 97-1544), besides the traditional forms of the Middle Ages (ballads, *canzoni*, allegorical poems), wrote elegies, epigrams, eclogues and sonnets; Mellin de Saint-Gelais (1487-1558) produced frank imitations of the Italian lyrical poets, and above all of Petrarch; lastly, Joachim du Bellay (1525-1560), in his famous *Défense et illustration de la langue française* (1549), clearly enunciates the ideal of the new art of poetry, which is to form itself on the models of the classics and their Italian imitators, renovating the language, the style, the metres, and the subjects of poetry. Du Bellay, Pierre Ronsard (1524-1585), and the other poets of the group known as *la Pléiade*, sought to realize these ideals in their poems.

Profoundly steeped in the spirit of the Renaissance is that most original of romances, the *Pantagruel* of François Rabelais (*d. c.* 1553), which in all its manifestations of encyclopaedic learning and satirical gaiety, all its attacks upon the absurdities of the old world, is overflowing with *joie de vivre*.

In Spain, earlier and more completely than in France, there was an invasion of Italian poetry and Italian verse forms, of which the principal representatives were Juan Boscán (1493-1543), Garcilaso de



la Vega, known as the Castilian Petrarch (1503-1536), and Diego de Mendoza (1503-1575).

In England, under Henry VIII, the Italianate lyric was successfully introduced by Sir Thomas Wyatt (1503-1542), who imitated Petrarch, and the Earl of Surrey (1517-1547).

In Germany the Reformation cut off relations with Italy and delayed by two hundred years the emergence of a modern literature.

The close of the Quattrocento and the first half of the Cinquecento marked the apogee of the Italian art of the Renaissance, in which the full unfolding of the classic elements, moulded into new forms by the inventive genius of great artists, produced works of vital originality and created modern art.

The architecture of the Renaissance, of which many of the most characteristic examples are to be seen in the palaces as well as the churches of the period, attained its highest perfection in the work of Donato Bramante of Urbino (1444-1515), the author of the first design of St. Peter's, whose genius was ripened by the study of the Roman monuments; Raffaello Sanzio of Urbino (Raphael: 1483-1520), who continued St. Peter's and built various palaces in Rome; Baldassare Peruzzi of Siena (1481-1536), who built the Palazzo Massimo in Rome; Antonio da Sangallo the younger (1485-1546: the Palazzo Farnese), and Jacopo Sansovino (1486-1570: the Biblioteca in the Piazza San Marco, Venice); Michele Sanmicheli, a Veronese (1484-1559), who worked in Verona and Venice; and lastly, that gigantic genius, Michelangelo Buonarroti (1475-1564), the creator of the Sacrestia Nuova of San Lorenzo and the Biblioteca Laurenziana in Florence, and the dome of St. Peter's in Rome.

Outside Italy, the architecture of the Renaissance had to contend against the persistence of Gothic, and the two styles were blended in certain French palaces and churches, until towards the middle of the century the new style triumphed. In Germany both the resistance and the mingling of styles were of longer continuance.

The sculpture of the Cinquecento would have been inferior to that of the previous century but for Michelangelo, who, proceeding from the foundation of a classic art, succeeded in giving expression in marble to conceptions whose strength and majesty were dictated

by his powerful idealism and his spiritual tension (David, Moses, the Medicean tombs in San Lorenzo). The same characteristics are found in his paintings (Sistine Chapel), and in both spheres he finally became a sovereign figure, influencing the entire tradition of later periods. But in painting he had many great contemporaries, among whom were the greatest artists who have ever lived: for example, Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519), the painter of the *Cana* and the *Gioconda*: a genius of wonderful universality, at once a painter, a sculptor, an engineer, and a student of the natural sciences: one of the completest products of the Renaissance; Raphael, inimitable in the blending of perfection of form with grace of feeling and power of expression: a unique and privileged nature, in whom antiquity and modernity were fused in a harmony never excelled (Stanze and Loggie in the Vatican; the portraits of La Farnesina, the Madonnas, the Transfiguration, portraits, etc.); and Antonio Allegri, known as Correggio (1494-1534), whose modelling is soft and lacking in precision, though his compositions are full of life and movement (cupola of the Duomo, Parma).

In addition to these great figures a whole series of regional schools of painting flourished in the Quattrocento and Cinquecento. There was the Lombard school, profoundly influenced by Leonardo, of which Bernardino Luini (*d.* 1530) was one of the ornaments; the Emilian, which included Francesco Raibolini, known as Il Francia (*d.* 1517); and the Umbrian, of which Perugino and Pinturicchio were the leading exponents (§ 79).

But the two greatest schools of painting were the Florentine and the Venetian. The first continued the painting of the Quattrocento in the graceful and expressive representation of the human figure, and in scholarly composition, while bringing to it a greater perfection of form and colour. First among the Florentine painters were Fra Bartolomeo della Porta (1472-1517) and Andrea del Sarto (1486-1531). The work of Del Sarto is characterized by opulence of form, splendour of colour, and profound understanding of tonality; also by its development of the landscape and its brilliant portraiture. Following upon the masters of the second half of the 15th century we have Giorgio Barbarelli, known as Giorgione (*c.* 1487-1510), one

of the creators of modern landscape painting; Jacopo Palma the elder (c. 1480-1528); the amazingly productive and versatile Tiziano Vecellio (Titian: 1477-1576), whose career embraced the greater part of the Cinquecento; Lorenzo Lotto (c. 1480-1556); and Paolo Caliari, known as Il Veronese (1528-1547), who in his later years was influenced by Michelangelo. Jacopo Robusti, known as Tintoretto (1518-1594), the movement, dramatic force, and bold invention of whose work achieved surprising effects, was also profoundly influenced by Michelangelo.

The influence of Italy on the painting and sculpture of the rest of Europe was predominant. In Flemish painting there was one movement which was completely dominated by the Italian influence, but beside this the native Flemish school continued to flourish. In Germany too—which in the first half of the 16th century produced two supreme painters in Albrecht Dürer (1471-1528), an artist of great power and profundity of thought, famous for his engravings as well as his paintings, and Hans Holbein the younger (1497-1543), eminent above all as a portrait-painter, in whom the Renaissance found complete expression—the imitation of Italian art finally submerged the national school.

The first half of the Cinquecento, under the influence of Humanism, which explored the ancient sources of wisdom and thirsted for every kind of knowledge, was a period of great scientific progress. The direct study of the classic texts, and the insatiable curiosity which sought out new paths, led the scientific thinkers, or, as they were then called, the natural philosophers, to free themselves from the yoke of Aristotelean scholasticism. Natural science, however, was still largely fantastic, almost mystical, conceiving the universe as an animate whole, and attributing to everything a life of its own and occult properties. Such a belief may perhaps explain the extraordinary importance which was now attributed to the study of medicine. The scientists of the period were nearly all physicians, but they were also astrologers, alchemists, students of magic. Nevertheless, they were responsible for many observations and a very appreciable amount of research.

In this field Italy balanced the activities of the outer world rather than dominated them. A contemporary of the two famous Germans,

Agrippa von Nettesheim (1486–1535) and Philip Theophrastus Bombastes von Hohenheim, known as Paracelsus (1493–1541), the Lombard Gerolamo Cardano (Cardanus: 1501–1574), was one of the great scientific figures of the period. For him the soul of the universe manifested itself in heat, and his theory of combustion was a close approach to the modern theory. In the investigations of such inquirers new chemical substances were discovered. This science of the Renaissance was still very remote from our modern experimental research. But the importance of experiment, and of the application of mathematics to experimental results, was clearly realized by Leonardo da Vinci, a genius who in many respects was in advance of his age.

The science of anatomy as regards the human body was founded by Vesalius of Brussels, the author of *De corporis humani fabrica* (1543), who had great experience in the dissection of human subjects, though he was not a pioneer in this respect. A very important Italian school of anatomy and physiology derived from Vesalius. One of his disciples, Matteo Realdo Colombo of Cremona, was the first to practise vivisection on dogs, and in *De re anatomica* he expounded the pulmonary circulation, already suggested by Servetus (§ 87).

Great progress was made in mathematics, especially by Italian workers. Cardanus, in his *Ars magna* (1545), expounded the algebraical solution of equations of the third and fourth degree, continuing the work of another able mathematician and student of mechanics, Nicolò Tartaglia (1500–1557), and he developed the notion of “imaginary quantities.”

But the greatest scientific work of the Renaissance came from remote and still semi-barbarous Prussia—the *De revolutionibus orbium caelestium* of Nicholas Copernicus (Kopernik) of Thorn (1473–1543), which repudiated the ancient theories, showing how much more simply the solar system could be explained by the hypothesis that the planets revolved round the sun. Copernicus thereby reversed the whole mediaeval conception of the worlds, according to which the earth was the centre of the universe. At the time this new theory did not attract much attention; Luther derided it, and Melanchthon considered it absurd and contrary to the Bible.

## CHAPTER XIV

### *REFORMATION AND COUNTER- REFORMATION*

#### *THE PAPACY AND THE EMPIRE RULE ITALY*

§ 87. THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE PAPACY AND THE EMPIRE, AND THE REFORMATION IN ITALY.—The agreement between Clement VII and Charles V, which consummated the downfall of Italian independence, has a symbolical value as a milestone of Italian history. There was no lack of dissensions between Papacy and Empire after this date; there was even a war, as we shall presently see. Nevertheless, apart from this one isolated episode, the Papacy no longer struggled for supremacy in Italy, contenting itself with the State of the Church, which the Empire no longer disputed. The Empire itself no longer attempted to assert its direct dominion in Italy, as of old; but it reaffirmed its suzerainty over the territory which had once been the Kingdom of Italy, and this with a greater certainty and completeness than had ever been known since the beginning of the communal era, as was apparent, not so much in Monferrato (§ 88) as in the Duchy of Ferrara, and in Florence, and afterwards in Siena. The Spanish dominion in Lombardy established itself only by means of the imperial investiture, just as in Naples and Sicily it depended on the Papal investiture. The supreme powers of the mediaeval world, defeated in the political field by Western Europe, now appeared in Italy as the final victors over the local autonomies and the independent Italian states, and with them and through them, resting on their moral and juridical foundation, the foreign dominion finally implanted itself.

In proportion as the Papacy declined in respect of its actual political dominion over Italy, so it gained in respect of its ecclesiastical and spiritual dominion. The first half of the 16th century saw nearly the

whole of Europe either escaping altogether from the dominion of Papal Rome by means of the Protestant Reformation—which began in 1517, and triumphed in Germany in 1555, but even earlier in England and the Scandinavian countries—or constituting Churches which acknowledged the Pope as their supreme head, but were solidly organized on the national soil and controlled by the monarchical ruler of the nation. This was the case in France and in Spain. France, by the concordat of 1516 between Leo X and Francis I, had definitively constituted the “Gallican Church,” in which the King of France exercised the power of nomination to bishoprics and abbeys (pending the Papal confirmation), while the fiscal rights of the Holy See to the income of the French Church were defined and restricted; and so was the ecclesiastic jurisdiction of the Pope, causes being decided, as a rule, on French soil and not in Rome. As for Spain, the power of the king over the Spanish Church was such that the ecclesiastical historians invented a term to describe it: namely, “Caesaropapism.”

Something of the same sort—though in a much less degree—occurred in the case of Venice, precisely because the republic was the only state in the peninsula which had remained powerful and completely independent. In the rest of Italy—and even in the Spanish dominions, although here it was subject to certain limitations and differences—the religious supremacy of the Pope (which implied the most important consequences, even in civil life) was not seriously disputed. The struggle against the Protestant Reformation had contributed enormously to the consolidation and extension of the Papal supremacy.

Their common interest in this conflict was one of the most important of the factors which led to agreement between the Papacy and the Empire. When Charles V was crowned by Clement VII in Bologna, the religious movement in Germany, which began in 1517 with Martin Luther’s preaching against indulgences, had already conquered a great part of Germany, through the adhesion of many of the states of the Empire, which placed themselves at the head of the new Churches. From the protest which these states presented in the Diet of Spires in 1529 against an unfavourable decision they had taken the name of “Protestant.” The two fundamental principles of the new Christian

confession were, justification by faith in Christ alone (so that the validity of the doctrine of redemption by works was denied, and therefore of the whole apparatus of Catholic devotion), and the acceptance of the Scriptures as the believer's only guide (which rejected the validity of ecclesiastical tradition and the Papal authority). Shortly after 1530 it began to make its way in France and Switzerland through the preaching of the Frenchman, Calvin, a still more radical and anti-Papal reformer, who established himself in Geneva, at the gates of Italy.

In Italy, despite the common belief, the ideas of the Reformation were widely diffused at first, for not only the social and cultural *élites* were accessible to them, but also the people. The movement, however, retained a predominantly individualistic character; it was a movement of personal conversions, which avoided an open rupture with the ancient Church of Rome, and it did not lead to the constitution of powerful organizations—which would, indeed, have been peculiarly difficult, since no Italian state gave its support to the new doctrines, and since the Papal authority was omnipresent in the persons of the bishops and princes who were faithful to it.<sup>1</sup> In Naples there was the discreet propaganda, edifying and mystical rather than revolutionary, of the Spaniard Giovanni Valdés (*d.* 1541), whose circle included such cultured ladies as Giulia Gonzaga and Vittoria Colonna; and through the latter Michelangelo was brought into touch with the movement. None of these laymen or laywomen broke with the Church. Rebellion came from the secular and regular clergy of the Waldensian circle, such as Bernardino Ochino of Siena (1487–1564), a Capucin, and the general of the Order, a celebrated and popular preacher, and the Florentine Pietro Martire Vermigli (1503–1562), an Augustinian canon. Another centre of the Reformation was Venice, thanks to the commercial relations of the city, and the greater tolerance and independence of its government. In the Venetian state the new ideas were propagated by several Franciscan friars, by Pier Paolo Vergerio, Papal Nuncio and Bishop of Capodistria (*d.* 1564), and a layman, Gerolamo Zanchi of Bergamo. In Piedmont there were a few isolated reformers, such as Celio Secondo Curione (1503–1569); and, which was much more important, the Waldenses (§ 49) adhered to

the Reformation according to Calvin in the Synod of Cianforan (1532).

But within the limits of Italian Catholicism—and with characteristics which in the beginning were not always distinguishable from those of the Evangelical movement in Italy—from 1520 onwards a movement of religious revival manifested itself in various forms of intense piety, and in the foundation of a number of religious Orders, directed very largely to the instruction of the people in the Catholic faith. Such were the Teatini (founded in 1524 by San Gaetano of Thiene and the Bishop of Chieti or Theate, Pietro Carafa), the Barnabites (1330), and the Somaschi (1532). A new and stricter Franciscan community was that of the Capucins (1528), who acquired great influence over the life of the people. From the very first the Papacy refrained from taking an active part in this movement of reform: Hadrian VI, who was favourably inclined, was Pope for two years only, and had to deal with an antipathetic Curia; Clement VII was a typical Renaissance Pope, entirely absorbed in politics; but Paul III, on the other hand (see below), notwithstanding his worldly character and his nepotism, was influenced by the reformist party, and conferred the cardinalate on its leaders: Contarini, Sadoletto, Carafa and the Englishman Pole, who in 1537 elaborated for his Order a bold plan of reform. Contarini, Pole, and other prelates—such as Morone, who was likewise created cardinal—were not immune to Evangelical influences. But their plan came to nothing, and Contarini, in Germany, failed to come to an understanding with the Lutherans. Carafa, on the other hand, gave the movement a definitely reactionary character, and persuaded the Pope to revive the Inquisition (1592), and to constitute a supreme tribunal in Rome (the Holy Office). This entered upon a vigorous repression of all Protestant tendencies in Italy. 1542 was a decisive and disastrous year for the Protestant movement in Italy: in this year Ochino and Vermigli fled across the Alps. However, the Protestant propaganda continued; in Venetia it was now diffused in the more radical form of Anabaptism, a sect which practised the baptism of adults and professed the internal illumination of the spirit, with the negation of the State, the Church, and all external coercion. An equally radical form of Protestantism, though it was



radical in a rationalistic rather than in a mystical sense, and one in which the Italians took a predominant part, was Antitrinitarianism, which, like the old Arian doctrine, denied the divinity of Christ in the name of Divine Unity. After the Spaniard, Servetus, who was burned at the stake under Calvin in Geneva (1553), the leading Antitrinitarians outside Italy were Lelius (*d.* 1502) and Faustus (*d.* 1604) Socinus of Siena. Generally speaking, the Italian fugitives in foreign countries—in Switzerland, Germany and Poland—were very influential, but mainly as critics and adversaries of the Church. Among them were the first champions of tolerance and religious liberty, which the Protestant Churches denied no less than the Catholics.

The remedy decided upon for the very serious religious crisis evoked by the Protestant movement was that of the General Council, which would define the points of controversy with the authority of the universal Church, and would at last provide for the ecclesiastical reform which had been invoked for more than a century, and the lack of which had furnished the soil that was most favourable to the religious revolution. In proposing the Council the Catholic reformist party was in full agreement with the Emperor, who hoped for the restitution of religious and political unity in Germany. The attitude of the Papacy in respect of the conciliary programme was more uncertain, for the Pope dreaded a diminution of his own power, and in particular a resurrection of the principle that the Council was above the Pope. The religious situation called for a permanent and intimate understanding between the pontiff and the Emperor, who were still in disagreement in respect of Italian politics; it called also for a sincere reconciliation between the Emperor and the King of France, who was known as "His Most Christian Majesty," and was, as it were, a second head of Christendom in the temporal order. Even in respect of this reconciliation the affairs of Italy were of capital importance, and the attitude of the pontiff in respect of these affairs was an element of prime significance.

(This complication of political and religious factors is the distinguishing character of Italian history during the period between the coronation of Charles V (1530) and the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis (1559). To this must be added the Turkish peril, which was both

political and religious in character, and with which the Pope and Italy were more urgently concerned than ever. Under Selim I (1512–1520) the Ottoman Empire had achieved an extraordinary expansion in the East, above all by the annexation of Syria and Egypt (1516–1517) and a great part of Arabia. The Turkish corsair Barbarossa, who had taken the place of the sovereigns of Tunis and Algiers, and had placed himself under the protection of the Sultan, now dominated the Mediterranean. The successor to Selim, Soliman the Magnificent (1520–1560), captured Rhodes—whence the Knights of Jerusalem removed to Malta, which had been given to them by Charles V—conquered nearly all Hungary, which in 1526 the Habsburgs had acquired by inheritance, and threatened Vienna. During this period, on the other hand, the peace concluded in 1503 between the Turks and Venice, when the republic had renounced various strongholds in the Morea, and above all, the very important fortress of Modone, was still in force. But it will be understood that a Turkish conquest of Austria would have meant the beginning of the end for the Venetian Republic.

§ 88. FINAL RESISTANCE TO THE SUPREMACY OF THE HABSBURGS IN ITALY. THE PEACE OF CATEAU-CAMBRÉSI.—Clement VII, after the reconciliation with Charles V, effected a new *rapprochement* with France, giving in marriage to the second son of Francis I, Henry (who afterwards became heir to the crown on the death of his elder brother), Catherine dei Medici (de Médicis), legitimate daughter of the Duke of Urbino (1533). On the death of Clement VII (25 September 1534) he was succeeded by Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, Paul III (1534–1549), who wavered more than ever between France and the Empire.

A fresh cause of hostility between these powers was the death of Francesco Sforza (1535) without heirs, and the consequent devolution of the Milanese duchy upon the Empire. Francis I, who had vainly solicited the investiture in the duchy for his second son, took up arms again; but he was opposed by the Duke of Savoy, Charles III (or more exactly, it would seem, Charles II), who was loyal to the Emperor. Since the reign of Amedeo VIII (§ 74) the state of Savoy had been passing through a phase of almost permanent decadence.

Now it was occupied and annexed by France (1576), who thus obtained a strong base in Italy. The Emperor, assisted by the Genoese fleet, then invaded Provence. Hunger and sickness and the impregnability of Marseilles compelled him to withdraw.

Against the Habsburgs the King of France had recourse to an alliance with the Turks. In 1535 Charles V undertook a victorious expedition against the Turks, restoring the princes dispossessed by Barbarossa and retaining La Coletta and other ports. Now (1537) Barbarossa ravaged the Neapolitan coast, whereupon the Pope and the Venetians concluded a league with the Emperor. He made an unsuccessful attack upon Corfù, but he occupied a number of islands in the Archipelago which were the property of Venetian families. In order to unite the Christian potentates against the Turks and to help the cause of the Council Paul III went to Nice, to act as mediator between the Emperor and the King of France, and he succeeded (June 1538) in arranging an armistice for ten years on the basis of the *statu quo*. The Council, however, which ought to have assembled in Mantua in May 1537, afterwards removing to Vicenza, was for various reasons unable to meet, and in May 1539 was suspended indefinitely. The powerful armada of the league came into contact with the Turks at Prevesa, at the mouth of the Gulf of Arta (September 1538), but withdrew without doing anything (owing, it was said, to the political duplicity of Charles V, who was hostile to Venice and the Venetian admiral Doria); and the Turkish dominion in the Mediterranean was reconfirmed. In 1540 Venice made peace with the Sultan, ceding various islands in the Aegean and the cities of Malvasia and Napoli di Romania. An expedition despatched against Algiers by Charles V (1541) met with disaster.

During the new war between Charles V and Francis I a crisis occurred in Florence which ended in the consolidation of the Medicean absolutism by a Spanish alliance. Against the Duke Alessandro, who was heedless and dissolute rather than actually tyrannical, an opposition party had been formed among the Florentine nobility, the leader being Filippo Strozzi, formerly a friend of the duke's; so that more exiles went to join the republicans already in exile. An appeal was made to the Emperor, begging him to re-establish the republic (1536),

but in vain; on the contrary, Charles now celebrated the nuptials of his natural daughter Margaret with the duke. A cultured and scholarly companion of the duke's in all his diversions and debaucheries, Lorenzino de' Medici (of the younger branch), conceived the idea of assassinating him, perhaps for the sake of the republic, or perhaps because he hoped as a legitimate Medici to replace him. Enticing him into an ambush, he stabbed him, with the help of a hired assassin (6 January 1537), and fled to Venice. The people did not rise, and a cousin of the murderer, Cosimo, the son of Giovanni delle Bande Nere (§ 85), was proclaimed head of the republic by the notables of the city, among whom was Guicciardini (9 January). An imperial decree appointed Cosimo hereditary duke, excluding Lorenzino from the succession. The Florentine exiles, mustering a small force, invaded Florentine territory, but at Montemurlo, near Prato, they were defeated by the Medicean troops (August 1537). Several of the leaders fell into the duke's hands and were put to death; Strozzi committed suicide in prison (1538).

The Truce of Nice between Francis I and Charles V was broken long before it was due to expire. After Charles V had enfeoffed the duchy of Milan to his own son Philip (October 1540), Francis I concluded another agreement with Soliman, and once more made war upon Spain and the Low Countries (1542), but without success. On the other hand, France was preponderant in the Mediterranean, thanks to the fleet of Barbarossa, which, in conjunction with the French fleet, and amidst the protests of all Europe against such an alliance, laid siege to Nice, the last city remaining to the Duke of Savoy. The city capitulated; but the fortress held out against the attacks of the enemy, who, as a relieving force was approaching, raised the siege (1543). Francis I, in view of the hostility aroused by the Turkish alliance—for in Germany Catholics and Protestants had entered into a league to support the Emperor against the Turks—and the damage done by Barbarossa on the coast of France, dismissed him with many presents. Barbarossa, as he withdrew, wrought the most terrible devastation on the coasts of Italy, carrying off thousands of prisoners. The Continental war continued more fiercely than ever. In 1544 the French were victorious in a great battle at Oeresole in Piedmont, but

they were defeated in Luxemburg and in Roussillon. Two armies, English and imperial, invaded France, meeting each other in Paris. By the Peace of Cr  py (18 September 1544) the King of France once more renounced all claims to the Milanese and the kingdom of Naples, but it was decided that the Milanese should be given as dowry to an Austrian princess who was to marry the third son of Francis I. He, however, died, and Charles V retained Lombardy as France had retained Piedmont.

Charles V now decided to solve the religious question in Germany and to consolidate the imperial power. In December 1545 the Council finally assembled at Trent. The German Protestants had refused to take part in it; the Emperor decided to take up arms against them, and with this end in view entered into a secret agreement with the Pope. The Schmalkalden War (1546–1547), so called because the Protestant League was concluded at Schmalkalden, ended in a great victory for the Emperor, who now believed that he could impose his programme of religious pacification. But already political and religious disagreement with the Pope had arisen. The proceedings in the Council had not corresponded with the Emperor's intentions; still less had the transference of the Council to Bologna (March 1547). The Pope, for his part, feared the power of the victorious Emperor, in respect not only of ecclesiastical questions, but also of political affairs in Italy.

In Italy certain attempts against the established order had proved abortive. In Lucca Francesco Burlamacchi conspired to overthrow the ruling oligarchy, to combine the Tuscan cities in a league, and to introduce religious as well as civil liberty; but the conspiracy was discovered, and Burlamacchi was sent to Milan and put to death (1546). More serious was the conspiracy of the Fieschi in Genoa. There Andrea Doria, now an old man, had transferred the command of the fleet, and the great *de facto* authority which he had exercised in the city, to his nephew Giannettino, who was ambitious and despotic. A bitter enemy of his, for political and private reasons, was Gian Luigi Fieschi, beloved by the people for his liberality. Fieschi entered into an understanding with France, and conspired with other citizens to overthrow the rule of the Doria and change the constitution. The rising took place on the night of 2 January 1547. Giannettino

was killed, and the conspirators appeared to be victorious, when Fieschi, in passing from one ship to another, was drowned in the harbour. The conspirators were dispersed and overpowered.

It was believed that Pier Luigi Farnese, Duke of Parma and Piacenza, had taken part in the conspiracy. He was a natural son of Paul III, who had erected the two cities into a duchy for him (1545), notwithstanding the vigorous opposition of the Sacred College. The Emperor, however, who maintained his own rights over the two cities, had not ratified the investiture, and was therefore all the more hostile to Farnese when the latter made advances to France. Paul III, dreading the preponderance of the Spanish power, would have preferred to see Milan pass to an Italian prince—if possible to a member of his own family—or if that was impracticable, to a French ruler.

Pier Luigi, a man of vicious propensities, but not without capacity as a ruler, relied on the support of the people against the nobles, who were therefore extremely hostile to him, and began to conspire against him. On the 19 September 1547 the duke was assassinated at the instigation of Ferrante Gonzaga, governor of Milan, who occupied Piacenza. In Parma the dead man's son Ottavio was proclaimed duke; he was the son-in-law of the Emperor, having married Margaret, the widow of Alezzandro de' Medici. Paul III entered into negotiations with Venice and with France, but they produced no concrete results. The Emperor laid claim to Parma as belonging to the Empire. While this question was pending Paul III died, at the age of eighty-two (10 November 1549). With the death of this pontiff, who had been a magnificent patron of the arts, we may consider that the Papacy of the Renaissance came to an end. During the Renaissance the political character of the pontificate had been absolutely preponderant over the religious, a state of affairs which had often produced very serious moral results. And with its passing one may say that there was an end of the so-called *grande nepotismo*, which consisted in creating principalities for the members of the family of the reigning Pope out of the territories of the Church. Although feudal investitures were conferred upon the relatives of subsequent Popes, they were of less importance, and the old nepotism was replaced by a "lesser nepotism," the Pope contenting himself with enriching his relations,

introducing them into the princely aristocracy of Rome, and giving them ecclesiastical or civil offices; while he often appointed a relative whom he had raised to the cardinalate (the "cardinal nephew") to be his prime minister, or—as it was then called—his Secretary of State.

On the death of Francis I (January 1547) his son Henri II (1547–1559) succeeded to the throne. The new king resumed hostilities with Charles V. In Italy, where Paul III had been followed by Julius III (1550–1555), there was war over the duchy of Parma, between the French, under whose protection Ottavio Farnese had placed himself, and the imperialists, who were supported by the new Pope, who was hostile to Ottavio; but a truce was presently concluded, which left Ottavio Duke of Parma. However, there was still war between France and the Empire in other parts of Italy and elsewhere. In Germany the Protestants under Maurice of Saxony made a victorious recovery (1552), and one result of this was the dissolution of the Council, which had returned to Trent. Henri II persuaded his ally Soliman to send a fleet into the Mediterranean, and this, after seizing Reggio, completely defeated the Spanish armada at Ponza. The Turkish admiral, having vainly awaited for some days the French fleet with which he was to have co-operated in an attack upon Naples, returned to Constantinople. The attempt to occupy Naples having failed, the partisans of France incited Siena to rebel against the Emperor. The infuriated people drove out the Spanish garrison, razed the citadel to the ground, and revived the constitution, receiving succour from Henri II.

Cosimo de' Medici, disturbed by the fact that Henri II had sent to Siena Piero Strozzi, son of Filippo, a Marshal of France and lieutenant-general of the king in Italy, invaded Siennese territory. The city defended itself heroically; Strozzi, in order to draw the besiegers away from it, forced the blockade and took to the open country. But the Medicean army, far stronger than his own, defeated him completely at Marciano in the Val di Chiana (2 August 1554). The defence of Siena was continued, even the women taking part in it, until famine compelled it to surrender (17 April 1555), on condition that its free government was guaranteed. About 200 families migrated, and the bolder spirits withdrew with Strozzi to Montalcino, where they con-

stituted a little republic, which surrendered in 1559. Cosimo obtained from Philip II the concession of Siena and of all that territory, including Orbetello, Talamone, Monte Argentaro, Porto Ercole, and Porto Santo Stefano, which constituted the *Stato dei Presidi* (1557) under Spain.

Meanwhile Charles V, prematurely worn out by physical ailments and the cares of government, had decided to entrust the helm of state to stronger hands. He concluded the Peace of August (1555) with the Protestant princes—by which pact the Lutheran princes, no less than the Catholic, were given the right to determine the faith of their subjects (*cujus regio ejus religio*)—and the Truce of Vaucelles with France (1556). He ceded to his son Philip II the Low Countries and the crown of Spain, with all the Italian dominions, while his successor in the Empire was his brother Ferdinand (1556–1564), already King of the Romans, Hungary, and Bohemia. Charles retired to the monastery of Yuste in Spain, where he died on the 21 September 1558.

In 1555 Julius III died, and was followed by Marcellus II. His pontificate lasted only for a few days, and he was succeeded by the head of the Inquisition (§ 87), Giovanni Pietro Carafa, who assumed the name of Paul IV (1555–1559). Paul ventured upon a last, desperate attempt to rescue Italy from the rule of the Spanish Habsburgs. And the world beheld the spectacle of the most zealous head of Catholic Christendom inciting the Turks against Hungary and Sicily, and the Protestants of Germany against the Catholic Emperor. He did succeed in persuading the King of France to break the Truce of Vaucelles, and when the Duke of Alba, viceroy of Naples, invaded the Papal dominions (1556) he contrived that a French army, commanded by the Duke of Guise, should enter Italy to oppose him. While Guise was driven back from the Napoletano, and while in Piedmont another French army was trying in vain to take Cuneo, Emmanuel Philibert of Savoy, at the head of a strong Spanish army, invaded France from the Low Countries and invested St. Quentin, the only fortress which barred the road to Paris. The French army of reinforcement, commanded by Montmorency, was completely defeated, and Montmorency himself was taken prisoner (10 August 1557). A few days later St. Quentin opened its gates to the besiegers. The Duke of Guise, recalled from



Italy, turned against Calais, the last remaining possession in France of the English, and occupied the city. This feat, and the fact that the Pope had effected a reconciliation with Spain, facilitated the negotiations for peace, which was actually concluded at Cateau-Cambr sis on the 3 April 1559.

The principal terms of this peace, which for the time being ended the long struggle between the French and Austrian houses, giving the latter house a temporary predominance in Europe, were as follows: France retained Calais, Metz, Toul and Verdun; in Italy she obtained the Marquisate of Saluzzo, but had to restore his hereditary dominions, including certain fortresses, to Emmanuel Philibert; Spain kept Lombardy, the Napoletano, Sicily and Sardinia. Genoa was confirmed in the possession of Corsica, the Duke of Mantua in that of Monferrato, which Charles V had inherited in 1536 as the heir of the Palaeologi, and Cosimo I in that of Montalcino. During the course of the war Philip II had already restored Piacenza to Ottavio Farnese.

§ 89. THE COUNCIL OF TRENT AND THE COUNTER-REFORMATION.—The Papacy, which had suffered defeat under Paul IV, when he made his last venture in the field of Italian politics, won a victory in the field of ecclesiastical politics, with the proceedings of the Council and the Counter-Reformation. The Council assembled yet once more, at Trent, in 1562, finally dissolving itself in 1563. It deliberated under the direction of Papal Legates; and its members voted individually, so that the more "Curialistic" Italians were in the stronger position.

As far as the desired agreement with the Protestants was concerned, the Council failed completely, owing to the attitude adopted by the Protestants, and because the Council formulated all the controversial points of dogma in accordance with the rigid Catholic doctrine. It was proclaimed that the foundation of the Faith was ecclesiastical tradition as well as the Holy Scriptures; that ecclesiastical authority alone was competent to interpret the latter; justification was attributed both to faith and to works; and the Catholic sacramental system was finally confirmed. There was a conflict between the Episcopalian movement, which maintained that the power of episcopal jurisdiction was derived directly from Christ, and the Curialistic, which held that

it was derived from the Pope, nor was any decision arrived at. However, the Papal authority won a great triumph in the fact that the Council was directed and controlled by the Papal Legates, while the conclusions of the Council and the right to interpret them were referred to the Pope for approbation. The Council arrived at a whole series of important decisions in respect of Catholic reform: the preachers of indulgences were suppressed and the pontifical taxes were reduced; the plurality of benefices was prohibited, and residence was made obligatory; provision was made for bettering the conditions of the parishes, and for reforming the religious Orders; while seminaries were instituted for the education of the clergy.

The Council of Trent was of enormous importance to Catholicism. It defined once and for all time the essential features of Catholicism, rendering its division from Protestantism irrevocable, while by its measures of reform it rendered its further growth possible.

The effects of the Catholic restoration were felt above all in the Papacy: the pontiffs of the Renaissance, intent on profane interests, were followed by Popes who were wholly engrossed in their ecclesiastical office. This transformation was neither complete nor constant; for example, nepotism continued in an attenuated form (§ 88); but on the whole there was a notable and lasting improvement of the Papacy. The political power of the Pope never again became what it had been; that was impossible, for the times had changed; even in the period of the Counter-Reformation the leader of Catholic policy was not the Pope, but Philip II. Even in this sphere, however, the Pope did not abandon his theoretical positions. Paul IV published (1559) a Bull which declared, by virtue of the plenary power over peoples and kingdoms which pertained to the Pope, that heretics were deprived of all dignities and rights, and that anyone could possess himself of their property. With the Spanish monarchy, although it was the champion of orthodoxy, the Papacy was often in conflict, on account of its "Caesaropapism" (§ 87). The numerous privileges which were claimed by the King of Spain in Sicily, as the heir of the Norman kings (the so-called *monarchia sicula*), were a special subject of controversy. Again, the Papacy met with difficulties outside Italy in respect of implementing the deliberations of the Council of Trent; the civil

governments wished to decide for themselves regarding the introduction of the disciplinary decrees, and there were all sorts of difficulties and delays, especially in France.

In Italy, on the other hand, the Popes were soon able to devote themselves in a wholehearted fashion to the work of the Counter-Reformation. The last remnants of Protestantism were now suppressed; following Paul IV, Pius V (1566-1572) was distinguished by his implacable zeal. Among the victims were Pietro Carnesecchi (*d.* 1567) and Antonio Paleario (*d.* 1570). The "Index of Prohibited Books" published by the pontiff in 1599, and periodically revised, facilitated the suppression of all unorthodox doctrines, while the Roman Inquisition, with its dependencies in various parts of Italy, provided for the repression and material punishment of the heterodox. In order to consolidate the Faith, and religious discipline, and to ensure their Roman uniformity, the pontiffs issued the Roman Catechism (1566), the revised Breviary (1568) and Missal (1570), and the revised text, obligatory for all, of the *Corpus juris canonici*, and of the Latin Bible, or Vulgate (1592).

The immediate influence of the new religious Orders contributed to the Catholic restoration even more effectively than the activities of the Pope. The character of the new Orders was very different from that of the old monasticism; they resumed, accentuated, and adapted to the new age the worldly activities on behalf of the Church which had been undertaken in the Middle Ages by the mendicant Orders (education, culture, charity, preaching, etc.). For these Orders asceticism was no longer an end in itself, but was the means of reserving the whole of one's individual energies for the benefit of the Church and the Order. In addition to the Orders already named, the following should be mentioned: the Oratorians, founded by St. Philip Neri (1515-1595), to which some celebrated scholars belonged; the Ursulines (1537) and Salesians (1610), which devoted themselves to female education; the Order of mission priests or Lazarists, founded (1624) by St. Vincent de Paul (1576-1660) for the evangelization of the people; the Daughters of Charity, who devoted themselves to nursing the sick, founded (1618-1629) by St. Vincent with the collaboration of Louise de Marillac. But the Order which beyond all

comparison was the most important was the Company of Jesus, which was founded (1534) before the convocation of the Council of Trent.

Its founder was Ignatius Loyola (Iñigo Lopez de Recalde y Loyola), a Spanish officer of noble family who dedicated himself to a life of asceticism (1491-1556). It was approved by Paul III (1540). Its organization was directed towards establishing the strictest subordination of all its members to the common objects of the Order, the complete renunciation of the member's own personality, and blind obedience to his superiors, "as though he had been a corpse." At the head of the Order was the General, who held that office for life, exercising the most plenary powers; under him were the Provincials (in charge of the provinces of the Order) and the Rectors (of individual monasteries). The General exercised the most searching supervision of the whole Order, but at the same time he was subject to the control of his assistants, and his power was limited by the General Congregation, which elected him, and could even depose him in certain cases. The Congregation consisted essentially of the professed friars, the highest grade of the Order, to which only a few attained, and none before the age of forty-five. These brothers, in addition to the three vows common to the religious Orders—the vows of chastity, poverty and obedience—took a fourth vow, peculiar to the Order, of unconditional obedience to the Pope. After entering the Order the religious followed a long course of studies, sacred and profane. But apart from the usual culture, an intense piety, based above all on the stimulation of the devout imagination, was nourished, in the members of the Order, by the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius, which as time went on became a standard of ecclesiastical and even of lay piety throughout the Catholic world.

The supreme aim of the Order was the instauration of the sovereignty of the Catholic Church and the submission and conversion of heretics and pagans. In the Catholic world it was the fervent propagandist of the absolute sovereignty of the pontiff, and of his infallibility (declared by the Jesuit Cardinal Bellarmine, one of the greatest theologians of the Counter-Reformation). To achieve such ends the Order endeavoured to exert the greatest possible influence by the education of the young, especially the children of the upper classes,

and of princes, in the universities, and in respect of general culture, by missions to the heretics and the heathen, by the exercise of the sacerdotal ministry, and above all by confession, and by providing aristocratic society and the courts of sovereigns with directors of conscience. In this latter sphere they found it useful to teach their penitents a morality which was characterized by a certain indulgence, based on a system of *probabilism*—it is permissible to perform actions whose morality is doubtful but probable, because based on good authority—of mental reservation—affirmations can be made which are false in themselves if they are mentally rectified by the person who makes them—and of motive—an action not in itself lawful is permissible if its intention is good.

The Order swiftly invaded the entire Latin world, and also Germany and Holland. It had numerous colleges, in which lay as well as religious pupils were educated: the most famous were the Roman College (1551) and the German College (1552), which, although in Rome, was intended for the training of German ecclesiastics.

§ 90. THE BATTLE OF LEPANTO.—At Lepanto the Papacy and the Catholic world won a victory over the Turks which was of the greatest benefit to Italy and the rest of Europe. Philip II had continued his father's campaigns against the Turks in Africa, but so far with little success. In 1560 a great Spanish fleet was destroyed near the island of Gerba. On the other hand, a colossal expedition sent against Malta by Soliman the Magnificent failed in its purpose, owing to the heroic defence of the Knights, directed by their Grand Master La Valette, and assisted by Spanish troops.

The situation in the Mediterranean had become more serious, especially for Italy and Spain, for the Turkish dominion had been established in Northern Africa by the efforts of Barbarossa (§ 88) and his successors, who occupied the whole of the region between Morocco and Tunis, resisting the Spaniards and subjecting the Arab and Berber chieftains of the interior. These barbaric rulers had built up a great naval power, and their principal ports became centres of piracy. The corsair captains (*reis*) formed a species of corporation (*Taiffa*), which was extremely powerful, and which constituted almost a state

in itself. The pirates of Northern Africa infested the Mediterranean until a century ago, when the French occupied Algeria (1830).

Under Selim II, who succeeded to Soliman (1566-1574), the war with Venice was resumed; the Turks invaded Cyprus, taking Nicosia and laying siege to Famagusta. The Venetians then appealed for aid to the other Christian Powers; and thanks to the strenuous efforts of Pope Pius V a league was concluded (May 1571) between himself, Venice, Spain, Tuscany, and Savoy, with the object of overthrowing the Turkish power. The allies were too late to save Famagusta. It was defended with heroic valour by Marcantonio Bragadino, at the head of less than eight thousand men, against an enemy of overwhelming strength, but it was forced to capitulate; not, however, before sixty-five thousand Ottomans had fallen during the siege. The terms of surrender were violated, the Christian generals were massacred, and Bragadino himself was flayed alive. Meanwhile the armada of the confederate powers had assembled at Messina. It consisted of a hundred and forty Venetian galleys under Sebastiano Venier and Agostino Barbarigo, and eighty-one Spanish under Gian Andrea Doria, twelve Papal galleys commanded by Marcantonio Colonna, three sent by the Duke of Savoy, under the command of Andrea Provana, and three by the Knights of Malta. Of the twenty thousand soldiers on board more than half were Italian. The supreme commander was Don John of Austria, the natural son of Charles V. At the mouth of the Gulf of Lepanto the Christian armada met the Turkish fleet under the command of Ali Pasha; it consisted of two hundred and eight galleys and sixty-six light sailing-ships. At the centre of the battle Venier and Colonna boarded the Turkish flagship; Ali was killed, and the Turkish line was completely shattered. The left wing, under Barbarigo, was equally victorious, though its commander was slain. Doria, with the right wing, extended his line of battle in such a way that the left Turkish wing was able to crush it, and escape in safety, after destroying the Christian rearguard, in which were the three Maltese galleys. The Turks, however, had suffered the most serious losses: between twenty and thirty thousand were killed, while twelve thousand Christian galley-slaves were restored to liberty (7 October 1571). Spain, unwilling to fight for the glory of Venice, did not continue the war;

and the republic, since the Turkish fleet had refitted in the Ionian Archipelago, was obliged to conclude peace, recovering certain commercial privileges in the East, but surrendering Cyprus and paying an indemnity (1573). La Goletta was recaptured by the Turks from the Spaniards. Nevertheless, the Battle of Lepanto marked a decisive moment in the relations between Europe and the Ottoman Empire. From this time forward the Turks curbed their aggressive policy, and the Christian world began to recover ground.

## CHAPTER XV

### *ITALY UNDER THE SPANISH DOMINATION*

§ 91. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PERIOD. CONDITIONS IN THE SPANISH STATES.—With the final establishment in Italy of Spanish domination in the political order, and that of the Pope in the spiritual sphere, the tumult of thought and action, the multiplicity and variety of mutually hostile governments and parties, which characterized Italian history from the 12th to the beginning of the 16th century, was followed by uniformity and silence under the rule of the foreigner, and the absolutist governments and ecclesiastical regime of the Counter-Reformation. Italy ceased to be a factor of European history; even those states which had remained independent now counted for very little in the sphere of international politics, or in the general destinies of the peninsula, which was now subjected to the direct rule or the preponderant influence of Spain. The only influence which was opposed to this preponderance was that of France, so that the Italian states were able, within certain limits, to oscillate between the two Powers.

However, all was not passivity in this period of Italian history. The constitutional movement in the principalities, and their transformation into modern states, continued in Tuscany and Savoy. The Savoyard state, indeed, acquired considerable political and military importance, thanks to which Italy still retained a vestige of political initiative. The Spanish dominion itself, by the fact that it extended from Milan to Sicily, and made its preponderance felt throughout the peninsula, together with the resulting rivalry between France and Spain, made the world more aware that there was such a thing as a unitarian Italian problem, and that this had its importance for the whole of Europe. The sense of a common nationality which united the various parts of the peninsula was not extinguished, but was becoming intensified.



The principal component states of Italy after the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis were:

(1) The Duchy of Milan from the Adda to the Sesia, the Kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, Sardinia, and the *Stato dei Presidi*, under the dominion of Spain:

(2) The Duchy of Savoy, comprising the territory lying between the Sesia and the Alps, with Transalpine Savoy;

(3) The Republic of Venice, comprising the territory between the Adda and the Adriatic, Istria, Dalmatia as far as Ragusa, and also Cyprus and Candia (Crete);

(4) Genoa, with the two Riviere, interspersed with imperial fiefs, and Corsica;

(5) The Marquisate of Monferrato and the Duchy of Mantua, united, notwithstanding their territorial separation, under the Gonzaga;

(6) The Duchy of Parma and Piacenza, under the Farnese;

(7) The Duchy of Ferrara, Modena and Reggio, under the Estensi;

(8) Tuscany, subject, excepting the little Republic of Lucca and the *Stato dei Presidi*, to Duke Cosimo di Medici;

(9) The Papal State.

Beside these larger states, there still persisted that multiplicity of lesser states of which we have already spoken (§ 75), and whose progressive disappearance, down to the time of the French Revolution, was a factor of conspicuous importance in the unification of Italy. The Marquisate of Finale, held by the Del Carretto, became a Spanish possession in 1598; the Pico di Mirandola and the Concordia were given dukedoms in 1617; and in the Pontifical State, besides the Duke of Urbino, there were now Castro and Ronciglione (in Latium) under the Farnese. To afford some idea of the complication and multiplicity of the small dominions still existing in Italy, we may cite the case of Lunigiana, where Pontremoli belonged to Milan, Sarzana to Genoa, and other parts to the Duke of Florence and to the Cibo; but there were also twenty-four feudal lordships, eight under the protection of Tuscany, eight under that of Spain, and eight directly dependent upon the Empire.

Of the states united to Spain, each had a separate administration,

so that in theory it retained its individuality, its local institutions—though their powers were limited, and they did not constitute an organic whole—and a form of popular representation. This, however, involved the representation of classes which were often in mutual conflict, so that it tended to increase the power of the supreme, non-Italian authority.

In Milan there was still a Senate, which dated back to the days of the Sforza, and whose judicial and administrative functions had been reconfirmed by Charles V (it consisted of a president, fourteen jurisconsults, and seven secretaries, chosen from the seven principal Lombard cities), and the Ufficio Camerale, another relic of the constitution of the Duchy as it was in the days of the Visconti and the Sforza, which administered all the revenues of the State and gave the decision in respect of claims against the fisc. There had also been instituted a Privy Council (*Consiglio segreto*) and a State Assembly (*Congregazione di Stato*). The individual classes had their own representation and their own privileges, and, making confusion worse confounded, on the top of all these organizations, this complication of purposes and competences, the ecclesiastical jurisdiction had its own taxes, its own judges, police, and prisons, and its own representative, the Archbishop, so that it was often in conflict with the civil authority.

In the Kingdom of Naples there was a parliament with three departments—representing the ecclesiastics, the nobles, and the demesnes (that is, the territories directly subject to the king, as forming part of the royal demesne, and not to the feudal lords). After 1642, however, it was no longer convoked, though the *seggi* or boards set up by the nobles continued to meet in the capital, and besides these there was one elected by the people. The parliament and the boards had to vote the taxes, which explains why the people hated the nobles, as they were held responsible for the oppressive taxation. The direct taxes were paid only by the poorer classes; the nobles and the clergy were exempt. Everything was taxed; so that Campanello declared that in the kingdom of Naples a man had to pay for the privilege of keeping his head on his shoulders. Donations were exacted in return for privileges, and on the occasion of every coronation, or birth, or

other event concerning the royal family. The method of collection was rendered more burdensome by the fiscal contractors or farmers, whose exactions were ferocious. The ordinary revenue, which in 1525 amounted to 2,350,000 lire, rose to 6,000,000 by the middle of the 17th century, while the economy of the country, hampered by heavy duties, monopolies, export restrictions, and depreciation of the currency, went from bad to worse. Of this heavy fiscal burden nearly all went to the tax-farmers and the creditors of the government, which received hardly enough to meet its inevitable expenses. In order to obtain money the monarch enfeoffed a very large part of his territory to ecclesiastical and lay *signori*. Above the people was the middle class, in opposition to the nobles and the clergy. It consisted mainly of jurisconsults and advocates, who in Naples were extraordinarily numerous. The Spanish government, playing on the vanity of the prosperous classes, created an enormous number of nobles; the new nobility and the old sought to rival each other in luxury, a form of emulation by which many were ruined, and the government gave them financial assistance in order to secure their allegiance. The higher clergy of the kingdom were supported in their claims to autonomy against the Church of Rome, but they became all the more subject to the political power. The intervention of Rome was curbed by the royal *exequatur* which was necessary before the Papal decrees could be carried into effect; and a special functionary, the "Grand Chaplain" (*Capellano maggiore*), was charged with the examination of these decrees, and in general, the investigation of everything appertaining to the relations between the clergy and Rome.

Sicily was particularly unfortunate in suffering the introduction of the Spanish Inquisition (the supreme ecclesiastical tribunal for crimes of heresy and the like, similar to the Roman Inquisition, but dependent upon the king), which owing to local opposition could not establish itself in Naples or Milan. The attributions of the parliament, divided into its three sections, ecclesiastical, baronial, and demesrial, were essentially restricted to the periodical voting of "donations," though on such occasions they were able to formulate political requirements. From 1567 onwards the parliament was represented by the so-called "Deputation of the Kingdom," an aristocratic instru-

ment of defence. The Spaniards monopolized the trade in corn, to the great economic loss of the islanders.

In Sardinia also there was a parliament consisting of three sections or *stamenti*, which was obliged to meet once in ten years, and which had certain legislative powers. The *Carta de logu*, an ancient local code, remained in force even under the Spanish domination. The condition of the island was deplorable; it was divided into 376 fiefs, almost all of which were dependent on Spanish *signori*; trade was falling off and the population was diminishing. Here too the Spanish Inquisition was introduced.

In order to govern Spanish Italy Philip II instituted in 1563 a "Supreme Council of Italy," on which there sat, together with the Spanish governors, two Milanese, two Neapolitan and two Sicilian members. Also, until 1674, "examiners general" were sent periodically from Madrid, but they did not substantially detract from the great powers of the governors. These latter, although they were sometimes soldiers rather than governors by vocation, and were sometimes lazy and incapable, on arriving in the country which they were to govern published a decree or "proclamation," which confirmed and modified the decrees of their predecessors, and comprised provisions relating to religious, economic, sanitary; judicial, and municipal affairs, and regulations effecting the currency. The *grida* or proclamation, as readers of *I Promessi Sposi* will remember, were as numerous as they were ineffective, whether because the police and the judiciary were unequal to their task, or by reason of special privileges and jurisdictions. Public order was very indifferently preserved, and this contributed to the decline of commerce and industry and the economic impoverishment of the country.

§ 92. VENICE, ROME, TUSCANY, GENOA.—The prosperity of the Venetian Republic suffered most severely as the result of the migration of commerce from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, and the hostility of the Turks. The Turks encouraged the English and the Dutch to trade in the Levant, allowing them to found commercial houses and to appoint their own consuls in the Levantine ports. Venice could not hold her own in the struggle for trade, and vainly sought to improve

her position by instituting special magistratures (such as the *Cinque savi della mercanzia*). The economic decline of the Republic was reflected in the life of the citizens; the nobility, abandoning navigation and commerce, contented themselves with enjoying their possessions on the mainland; idleness and vice increased, and gambling became general, although on many occasions the severest laws were introduced to prevent it.

The 16th century saw the final transformation of the aristocratic government of Venice into an oligarchy. The fundamental organs of the State remained the same. The popular assembly or *Avengo*, in which were convoked all the inhabitants of maritime Venice, from Grado to Cavarzere, disappeared after 1423, except that it still met to hear the name of the new Doge announced. The Grand Council exercised the legislative power, and nominated members of the other councils and the magistratures. Membership of the Grand Council was still restricted to the families inscribed on the roll of the nobility; and inclusion in this roll was now more rigidly controlled, thanks to the "Golden Book," which was instituted in 1506, and in which the births and marriages of the noble houses were registered. (In 1506 it was found that there were 1,671 nobles.) Inclusion in the ranks of the nobility *per grazia* was rendered increasingly difficult; it therefore will be understood that the numbers of the members of the Grand Council were constantly diminishing. In the first half of the 16th century there were about two thousand; in the last days of the Republic there were only twelve hundred. The actual direction of affairs was no longer exercised by this assembly, but was entrusted to smaller committees. The Grand Council elected the Senate, a name assumed at the close of the 14th century by the ancient *Pregadi* (§ 57). It had at first been convoked only on special occasions, but afterwards it was assembled regularly. The number of sixty original members was increased by the *zonta* of another sixty, and by extraordinary augmentations which sometimes brought the number up to three hundred. It dealt with foreign, commercial and military affairs. Another body elected by the Grand Council was the *Quarantia* (instituted in 1179), a supreme tribunal, which had also political and administrative powers. It consisted of forty members, and was divided into a civil and a

criminal court. The three heads of the criminal *Quarantia* with its six ducal councillors (the "Lesser Council"), together with the Doge, constituted the "Serenissima Signoria (*Dominium*) Veneta," a name which was finally introduced in official documents in the middle of the 15th century, replacing the name of the Venetian Republic: a change which symbolized the internal transformation of the State. The Signoria convoked and presided over the Grand Council, which submitted all legislative proposals to the Signoria. For centuries the Doge had no longer exercised an autonomous power of decision; he was the supreme executor of the decisions of the Council, and above all, the official representative of the State. His great influence derived from his presidency of the Councils, in which he had the right of making proposals at any moment. The most powerful political organ was the Council of Ten, nominated annually by the Grand Council, which increased its numbers, when it thought fit, by a *zonta* of ten or twenty more members: but the *zonta* was finally abolished in 1582 by the Grand Council, which then precisely defined the attributions of the Ten. They were supposed to be concerned more essentially with attempts against the security of the State and the crimes of the nobles; but notwithstanding all attempts to circumscribe their competence the Ten contrived to obtain such power that they actually ruled the State, by means of the clause which referred to them all affairs demanding the greatest secrecy. An organ of theirs which acquired an autonomous importance as great as that of the parent body was constituted by the three Inquisitors, first elected in 1539, who towards the end of the 16th century assumed the title of Inquisitors of State; a name which became famous, or rather infamous, dreaded, and abhorred, thanks to the terrifying legends, very largely the work of the imagination, which gathered about this institution. It was their duty to undertake secret and careful investigation of crimes denounced by their paid informers, or sometimes by occasional and voluntary (even anonymous) informers; the results of such inquiry being submitted to the Ten. An organ created to assist the Senate, preparing reports on current affairs, was the *Collegio*, which was instituted about 1440, and which in actual fact took over the despatch of public affairs, usurping the powers of the Senate. The *Collegio* was

divided into three sections: the *Sei savi grandi*, who studied and formulated such proposals as were deemed essential for the good of the State; the *Cinque savi agli ordini*, which examined matters relating to maritime affairs; the *Cinque savi di terraferma*, who dealt with internal affairs, especially military and financial. The *Collegio* had a consultative voice in all questions submitted to the Senate, and drafted its decrees, and the letters of the Doge and the Signoria. The assembly of the Signoria and the *Collegio* was the "full *Collegio*," whose function it was to open despatches from abroad and from the governors of the provinces, to receive ambassadors and other political personages, and to decide administrative and ecclesiastical controversies of a special kind. In short, it constituted the supreme organ of government.

The State had thus assumed an oligarchical structure, and the more important offices were monopolized by a limited number of families; so that the oligarchy became a clique, which excluded the great majority of the nobles from the control of public affairs. This applied more particularly to the poorer class of nobles, a class which was created by the natural inequality of fortune. Beneath the nobles, or *majores*, the rest of the people were deprived of any sort of political right; they did not even enjoy equality of civil rights, nor, of course, of social position. They were divided into *mediocres* and *minores*. The *mediocres* were those burgesses who were engaged in the liberal professions, the fine arts, and commerce, and they constituted the *cittadini originari*; and to these must be added those foreigners who had been conceded the privilege of Venetian citizenship *per grazia*, and with it the right to follow a trade or profession or practise the arts. Below the *mediocres*, (whose numbers were restricted) were the plebeian *minores*, following the calling of boatman or fisherman (both of which were of primary importance in Venice) or practising the industrial arts or crafts. The *popolo minuto* had a representative of their own, the *gastaldo dei Nicolotti* (Nicolotti and Castellani were two sections of the Venetian population, living at the two extreme points of the city), who had certain privileges and representative functions, but no political rights. The *borghesia* and the *popolo minuto* were grouped (as in the other Italian states) in the *corporazioni delle arti*, which were economic and technical organs, and the confrater-

nities or *scuole*, which exercised certain religious and beneficent functions. The six *scuole grandi* or great confraternities were reserved for the *borghesia*. In 1732 there were nearly 300 confraternities in Venice.

The regions subject to Venice were regarded as dependent territories, not as united with the capital in a single organism, and they did not participate in the political life of the republic. The individual cities retained their statutes, and even their feudal ordinances, as Venice made no attempt to introduce uniformity in her dominions.

From 1530 onwards the Italian policy of the Venetian Republic was almost exclusively passive, its aim being to preserve the *statu quo*. The republic had every reason to fear the preponderance of the Habsburgs; especially as it was trapped between the dominions of the Spanish Habsburgs and those of the Austrian. It therefore kept on the best of terms with France, but generally speaking it was extremely careful to avoid any initiative of too bold a character.

One consequence of the dissension between Spain and Venice, which was permanent, however completely dissimulated, was the small effect of the victory over the Turks at Lepanto (§ 90). The peace of 1573 was repeatedly confirmed, and the republic did its utmost to maintain good relations with the Porte. Apart from isolated incidents, peace was preserved until about the middle of the 17th century.

The Pontifical State, after the unsuccessful attempt of Paul IV, was even more passive in its policy than Venice. Its position was particularly delicate, for it had just as much need as the other Italian states of equilibrium between France and Spain, while the prominent part played by Spain in respect of the Counter-Reformation compelled the Papacy to take more account of Spain. Nevertheless, the ecclesiastical conflicts between Rome and Madrid, or the Italian dependencies of Spain, were frequent and serious.

The weakness of the Pope as territorial sovereign was in contrast with his great importance as head of the Church. The pontiffs were chosen with regard to this second function rather than in view of the necessities of the Papal State, and the great Catholic powers, and even some of the minor Italian states (such as Tuscany), intervened



largely in the Papal elections. The Empire, France, Spain and even Portugal came to exercise the right of excluding this or that candidate; an arrangement which continued in force down to our own days (in 1903 the right of exclusion was exercised against Rampolla).

The energies of the pontiffs were absorbed during this period by the Counter-Reformation and the general political and ecclesiastical affairs of Europe. They expended no continuous and organic effort (which, of course, was rendered difficult by the frequent change of sovereign) in the government of the temporal state, in which conditions were worse than in any other European state. In no other state had local feudalism retained so much power; and this feudalism was divided into petty Guelf and Ghibelline factions. The central administration was excessively weak, the finances were usually in a bad condition, and since a great part of the revenue was hypothecated to pay debts, the government increased it by the sale of offices. Brigandage was a chronic plague, which continued into the 19th century.

In the second half of the 16th century Pope Pius V (§§ 89, 90) was followed by Gregory XIII, a Boncompagni of Bologna (1572–1585), the reformer of the Julian Calendar, who did much to develop the Roman seminaries (the Roman College of the Jesuits, § 89); his pontificate was marked by a limited return to nepotism, for he conferred fiefs upon his natural son Jacopo, who was born before he had entered the priesthood; but outside the Papal State. He reorganized the diplomatic service of the pontificate, increasing the number of permanent nuncios. But he left the Papal State in a very bad condition as regarded public security, for brigandage had largely increased. Measures to extirpate this plague, long remembered for their vigour and severity, were employed by Sixtus V (1585–1590), a Peretti from the Marches: a Franciscan of very humble origin, whose person has been surrounded by many legends. However, at the close of his pontificate brigandage emerged once more. The name of Sixtus is memorable also for the great number of buildings and public works by which his pontificate was distinguished (Via Sistina). But in this respect he had both predecessors and successors, who gave “Baroque Rome” its pompous, dignified and picturesque appearance. He

completely reorganized the administration of the Curia by the system of the Congregations—a kind of ministerial committees, presided over by cardinals who were assisted by counsellors; a system which in its broad outlines is in force to this day. It was he, moreover, who fixed the number of cardinals at sixty.

Under Clement VIII (1592–1605), an Aldobrandini, born at Fano, though his family was of Florentine origin, who relied very largely, in the government of the state, on his nephew, Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini—a fact of great importance to the Papal State was the return of Ferrara to the direct rule of the Holy See after the death of Alfonso II (1597), who left no legitimate heirs; though Cesare, the son of a natural son of Alfonso I, retained Modena and Reggio as fiefs of the Empire. For Ferrara this was the end of her splendour. Under Clement VIII there were two trials which have been remembered for very different reasons: the trial of Beatrice Cenci, decapitated for the murder of her father, and the trial of Giordano Bruno (§ 96), burnt at the stake as a heretic.

The government of Duke Cosimo di Medici (1537–1574) marked the transformation of the republican city-state of Florence into the absolutist, regional state of Tuscany: a transformation which, as we see, was effected a good hundred and fifty years later than in Lombardy. It must not be supposed that this change involved the total disappearance of ducal particularism, or that it sounded the knell of the privileged position of Florence; but officials of the central government were appointed throughout the state, and many general laws were introduced, while the personnel of the government was drawn from various parts of the state. Of all the old Tuscan republics, Lucca retained its independence, relying on Spain and on Genoa to save it from absorption. It was governed by a *gonfaloniere* and nine ancients, who constituted the bimonthly *signoria*, the Council of Thirty-six, which was elected every sixth month, and the Great Council of Ninety. All these bodies were elected by those in office, so that the government of the city was actually a closed oligarchy.

The exiles having been exterminated or dispersed, Cosimo I ruled with wisdom and justice, apart from his arbitrary methods when *raison d'état* was invoked. He gave ear to the grievances of private

individuals, admitted them readily to his presence, and administered immediate justice. The public security was safeguarded by severe laws; the vigilance of the police was extreme, and it extended even to the religious sphere, for Cosimo was strictly opposed to any infiltration of Protestantism, though he exercised control, through his own officials, over the proceedings of the Roman Inquisition. He restored the finances of the state, cancelling debts, digging canals, draining marshes, and improving the harbours of Leghorn and Portoferraio, while he helped Pisa to develop its own economic life, which had been repressed by the dominant city. For the defence of the state he instituted a local militia of the type which had been adopted in the last years of the republic, but for his personal bodyguard he employed German and Spanish infantry. He did much to protect the coast, which was infested by Barbary corsairs: besides fortifying Grosseto and establishing outlook stations along the coast, he instituted in Pisa the Order of the Knights of St. Stephen (1561), who armed a certain number of galleys to reinforce the small ducal navy.

Cosimo was afflicted by great domestic misfortune: one by one his two sons Giovanni and Garzia and his wife Eleonora (*d.* 1562) died of malaria. There were rumours of terrible family tragedies, but these were without foundation. Soon after the death of his duchess he delegated the despatch of ordinary affairs to his son Francesco (1564), while reserving the title of duke and the supreme direction of the state. In 1569 Cosimo received from Pius V the title of Grand Duke of Tuscany, when he was crowned in Rome. The Duchies of Ferrara and Mantua protested, unwilling to grant precedence to Tuscany, while the Empire, which still regarded Florence as an imperial fief, together with Spain, opposed the pontifical decree, which they regarded as an intrusion of the ecclesiastical power into temporal affairs. These disputes continued for some years, until Cosimo's successor, Francesco, was confirmed in his title by the Emperor on payment of a great sum of money (1576).

Francesco (1574–1587) was greatly inferior to his father. His despotism was aggravated by the fact that he surrounded himself exclusively with noble courtiers, shutting himself away from the people. One of the Pucci conspired against his government, and other notable

Florentine families were involved in the conspiracy; it failed, its leader was executed, and the property of a number of citizens was confiscated (1575), which led to the belief that the duke's appetite for money played a very great part in the affair. Scandalous reports and much ill feeling were excited by the duke's relations—before he succeeded to his father—with a Venetian noblewoman, Bianca Capello, whom he married after the death of his mother. For some time a brother of Bianca's was virtually at the head of the government. The country, devastated by famine, pestilence, and banditry, lost a great deal of its prosperity. However, Duke Francesco earned the gratitude of Leghorn, completing the harbour and creating a city where there had been only a fortress.

He was succeeded by his brother, Cardinal Ferdinand I (1587–1609), who resigned the cardinalate and married Christine of Lorraine, declining the matrimonial proposals made by the King of Spain. Unlike Francesco, who was the complete Spaniard, Ferdinand adopted a much more independent attitude in respect of the hegemonical power, making approaches to France and entering into relations with Venice. He too did much for Leghorn, opening its gates to the Jewish refugees from Spain and to those who were fleeing from justice, thereby increasing the population and stimulating trade. He undertook works of drainage and reclamation in Val di Chiana and the Maremma, and rectified the course of the Arno. During his reign the Knights of St. Stephen took Bona in Algeria from the Moors.

Genoa, like Venice, suffered severely from the changes which had occurred in respect of commercial traffic, while she lost her overseas possessions (excepting Corsica) even earlier than Venice. But down to the time of the French Revolution she preserved her independence, which in earlier centuries had suffered such frequent interruptions. The constitution which Andrea Doria (§ 85) had given the republic was based on the earlier institution of the *alberghi*—groups of families who enjoyed political rights and the control of public offices. Previously the *alberghi* had been composed only of noble families, with the exception of one *popolare*. Doria's constitution provided for 23 noble families and 5 *popolari*. All those who were inscribed in the *alberghi* were included in the *Liber civitatis*, which corresponded to

the "Golden Book" of Venice; but it was less exclusive, as further inscriptions of *popolari* could be made yearly, until ten families were included. Nevertheless, there were certain differences in respect of the rights of the old noble families, who constituted the Company of St. Luke (*Corpo di San Luca*) and the new families, who were enrolled in the Company of St. Peter (*Corpo di San Pietro*). From the persons inscribed in the *Liber civitatis* the four hundred members of the Grand Council were chosen each year by lot, and from their midst a Lesser Council of one hundred was drawn, also by lot. The two Councils debated and voted on legislative proposals. The executive power was exercised by the Doge, assisted by eight Governors, all holding office for two years, and elected by a commission drawn from the two Councils. It was the office of the Doge and the Governors to submit legislative proposals to the Councils and to decide upon questions of foreign policy and of peace or war. Internal order and the police were the province of the "Inquisitors of State." A body of *sindacatori* examined the record of retiring magistrates and saw to it that the laws of the constitution were observed.

After the conspiracy of Fieschi (§ 88) this constitution was modified. The Grand Council was composed of 300 members chosen by lot, and 100 elected by the executive power; the Lesser Council was chosen, also by lot, from the Grand Council. In 1573 the new nobility, who considered that the reform was to their disadvantage, rebelled against it. They were opposed by the old nobility, led by Gian Andrea Doria, the son of Giannettino (§ 90). The Pope, Spain, and the Emperor intervened, and the matter was submitted to arbitration. By the award pronounced in March 1576 the *alberghi* were abolished, and a single order of nobles was constituted, without class distinctions. The Grand and Lesser Councils, retaining the same number of members, were elected by a small electoral body of thirty persons. Further, a Senate of twelve "Fathers" was established, and these were chosen by a mixed procedure, which combined election with the drawing of lots. The ex-Doges formed the body of "Perpetual Procurators." From this time forward the constitution was unchanged until the French Revolution. The hegemony exercised by the Doria family ceased after the death of Gian Andrea in 1606.

All that was left of the ancient dominions of Genoa in the Mediterranean was the island of Corsica; but henceforth its possession constituted a source of weakness rather than of strength for the republic, owing to the backward condition of the islanders and their rebellious attitude toward their Genoese rulers. Genoa had always failed to keep satisfactory order in the island, which was shamefully exploited by the Genoese governors and their officials. In the years immediately preceding the Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis there had been a great revolt against Genoese rule, led by Sampiero di Bastelica or di Ornano (1563), in conjunction with the Franco-Turkish war against Spain and Genoa, the ally of Spain. Even after peace was concluded and the French had withdrawn Sampiero continued to resist, aided by the Barbary corsairs, and surreptitiously by France, until in 1567 he was killed in a family vendetta. But the malcontents were still giving trouble in this ill-governed island.

§ 93. **PIEDMONT.**—The Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis, although it had restored Emmanuel Philibert (1553–1580) to the possession of his states, had left the French in temporary possession of Turin, Chieri, Pinerolo, Chivasso and Villanova d'Asti, until the pretended rights of the King of France to the Savoyard states had been investigated. In the subsequent negotiations the duke was greatly assisted by his wife Marguerite, the sister of Henri II of France, a woman of rare intellectual and moral distinction. At the end of the year 1562 France restored the above cities with the exception of Pinerolo, to which Savigliano and Perosa were attached; and Spain, having held Asti and Santhià during the French occupation, was now unwilling to evacuate them. Not until 1574 did Emmanuel Philibert succeed in persuading Henri III to restore the territory still in French occupation, when the Spaniards were obliged to evacuate Asti and Santhià.

The duke was set upon territorial expansion, and before all he was anxious to re-establish the old Savoyard sovereignty over Genoa. To this end he proposed the formation of a Catholic League in accordance with Rome; and under the circumstances, being already a fervent Catholic, he was induced to persecute the reformers who had become so widely diffused throughout the country during the period

of French rule, and he proceeded to make war upon his own subjects in Val del Chisone and Val del Pellice. His military expeditions against the mountaineers (1560–1561) encountered the most valiant resistance, and the duke, at the persuasion of his wife, who was in favour of religious toleration, granted the reformers (by the Pact of Cavour, June 1561) liberty of worship in the valleys (the same liberty, of course, to be enjoyed by the Catholic religion) and liberty of conscience elsewhere. At a later date cruel and vexatious measures were introduced by applying certain provisos of the treaty, but on the whole the agreement was respected. However, measures of proscription were taken against the other Protestants in the State, but after a while they too were granted liberty of conscience, though not of worship.

Emmanuel Philibert was greatly concerned to improve the status of the Catholic clergy, and he favoured the application of the reforms decreed by the Tridentine Council. At the same time, he safeguarded the interests and the sovereignty of the State, even in the ecclesiastical domain. He obtained from Gregory XIII the confirmation of the indult which Amedeo VIII had received from Nicholas V in 1451, after his renunciation of the Papacy (§ 74), by the terms of which the Pope had to consult with the duke upon appointing bishops and abbots, and the ducal *placet* was necessary before an incumbent could enter into the possession of other ecclesiastical benefices. In return, he had to abandon his opposition to the appeals of his subjects to the Roman tribunals; but he finally introduced the institution of the *apello per abuso* to the Senate against the encroachments of the ecclesiastical courts. Moreover, as in Tuscany, the activities of the Inquisition were kept under control.

The whole administration of the State was modified in the direction of uniformity and centralization. The duke practically suppressed—by failing to convoke them—the assemblies of the Estates, which had fallen into complete desuetude during the French occupation. He reformed the civil and penal legislation of the State, and the administration of justice, in the direction of simplicity and unity; over the local judges he appointed provincial judges or prefects, and as the courts of last instance he retained the two parliaments established by the French in Turin and Chambéry, which were henceforth known

as Senates. A general and organic revision of the *Statuta Sabaudiae* was undertaken; and such part of it as was published was printed in the Italian tongue, which became, together with French, the official language in the place of Latin.

On the elimination of the Estates the duke provided for the needs of the exchequer independently, or by means of local agreements. The direct and indirect taxation was heavy under Emmanuel Philibert, but the revenues were prudently administered in such a way as to liquidate the majority of the governmental debts and constitute a reserve fund. The duke furthered the economic development of the countryside. He gave much attention to agriculture, and especially to irrigation; he established or developed, by means of privileges and protective measures, various industries, and especially the textile; he played an active part in the promotion of mining companies in the Val d'Aosta; and he improved communications. These latter greatly benefited, quite apart from the systematization introduced, and the covering of new territory, by the acquisition of the County of Tenda, which gave access to Nice and Oneglia, and provided the Piedmontese dominions with an outlet to the sea. The duke was anxious to acquire Savona also, and was ill pleased with Genoa, which had damaged its trade; but he was not able to satisfy this ambition. He also endeavoured to restore the financial circulation and stabilize the currency.

Armaments were the object of special attention. Emmanuel Philibert introduced a limited form of compulsory service, raising a military contingent from every parish, which contingents were given regular training by a corps of sergeants. He also raised squadrons of cavalry from among the peasantry, but these were recruited by voluntary enrolment. The nobles, on the other hand, were not encouraged to enter military service. In addition to these territorial contingents, which would serve only in case of war, there were the usual companies of professional soldiers, some engaged in garrison duty in time of peace, some enrolled in accordance with the needs of the moment, by captains who were permanently at the disposal of the government. These professional soldiers also were enlisted mainly from among the duke's subjects.



Emmanuel Philibert provided also for naval requirements; he built up a little fleet, some units of which took part in the Battle of Lepanto, where they suffered heavy losses. For the enlargement of his fleet he had recourse, in imitation of Cosimo's example, to the knightly Order of SS. Maurice and Lazarus, constituted by reviving and combining pre-existent Orders. The Order, however, failed in its purpose, and the fleet declined.

Since the hopes inspired by the first four years of the Catholic League were not fulfilled, Emmanuel Philibert adopted a policy of neutrality in respect of France and Spain. In Italy he sought to enter into a close understanding with Venice, but the republic, in accordance with the passive character of its politics, confined itself to mutual exchanges of friendship without entering into formal pledges. Hence in order to safeguard his frontiers, integrate his territory, and procure troops in the event of war, the duke made special efforts to conclude agreements with the Swiss. In 1560 he renewed an old treaty of alliance with the League of the five Catholic Cantons; with Berne, Fribourg and Valais negotiations were at once more difficult and more important, as their relations with Geneva, and certain territorial questions, constituted obstacles to an understanding. When this was effected by the Treaties of Nyon and Lausanne (1564) the duke had to wait for the *benepiacito* of the Pope and Spain. By the end of 1567 it was possible to implement the understanding, by which the duke, accepting the *statu quo* in respect of Geneva, recovered the southern shore of the Lake of Geneva (Genevois and Chablais) and the district of Gex. Subsequent agreements completed the understanding, especially a defensive league of twenty years' duration which was concluded between Savoy and Berne.

§ 94. RESUMPTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL POLICY OF CHARLES EMMANUEL I.—Up to the end of the 16th century France was unable to give close attention to Italian affairs, owing to the civil wars between the Catholics and the Calvinists, which were merged in the war for the succession to the throne of Henri III (1589), the last of the Valois. By virtue of the Salic Law, he was succeeded by Henri of Navarre (Henry IV), of the younger branch of the Bour-

bons; but the "Ligue" of the Catholic extremists of France refused to acknowledge him, and the Pope declared him incapable of succession. The Ligue was supported by Philip II of Spain, who had hopes of crushing and conquering France.

The son of Emmanuel Philibert, Charles Emmanuel I, who succeeded to his father in 1580, felt that he must seize the opportunity of territorial expansion at the cost of France and the Protestants. He therefore allied himself closely with the Hispano-Catholic party (in 1585 he married Catherine, the daughter of Philip II), a course which was in direct conflict with the interests of Savoyard and Italian equilibrium, and the conduct of Ferdinand of Tuscany, and of Sixtus V, of whom the latter, after delivering his judgement against Henri of Navarre, had prudently adopted a waiting attitude. Charles Emmanuel occupied the Marquisate of Saluzzo (1588), which France had retained for some decades after the lines of marquises had become extinct, on the strength of an alleged feudal connection with Dauphiné, and he vainly attempted the reconquest of Geneva, the war with the republic lasting for about a year. With the help of the Governor of Milan he invaded Provence (1590), occupying several cities. He was opposed by the Grand Duke of Tuscany (Ferdinand), whose forces occupied the Île d'If, near Marseilles. The troops of Henri IV carried the war across the Alps, invading Piedmont, and hostilities dragged on indecisively. Henri IV, converted to Catholicism and acknowledged by all parties in France, was assailed by Clement VIII, and with Philip II he concluded the Peace of Vervins (1598) on the basis of the *statu quo*. Savoy was included in the peace, but the question of Saluzzo, still unsettled, led to a resumption of hostilities. The final reconciliation between Henri IV and Charles Emmanuel was effected by the Peace of Lyons (17 January 1601). By this Henry ceded the Marquisate of Saluzzo, with the exception of Casteldelfino, receiving in exchange the ducal territories on the right bank of the Rhône (Bugey, Valromay, Gex).

A question which appeared to give rise to serious complications was that which arose between the Venetian Republic and the Holy See during the pontificate of Paul V (1605-1621)—Camillo Borghese, a Roman, who greatly enriched his relatives. The dispute was merely

an outstanding episode of the chronic enmity between the Venetian government and the Roman Curia, which arose from the ecclesiastical policy of the republic; this being calculated to keep the clergy as far as possible subject to the State. The republic had revived a law which forbade ecclesiastical bodies to acquire landed property, and it had also arrested two priests who were charged with serious offences. Paul V demanded the repeal of the law and the release of the two priests; as he was not obeyed, he retaliated with excommunication and the Papal interdict (1606). The republic bade the clergy disregard the interdict; and those who did not obey—chief among whom were the Jesuits—were exiled. There was a very lively war of pamphlets, the Venetian protagonist being the Servite, Paolo Sarpi (1552–1623), a jurist, an influential politician, and a bitter enemy of the Roman Curia, who paid for his hostility by suffering repeated attempts upon his life. The two parties in conflict began to arm themselves, and the Spanish Governor of Milan followed suit; whereupon Henri IV made it known that he would come to the assistance of the republic if Spain attacked it. Consequently, the two Great Powers at last entered into conversation, and by the mediation of Henri IV the quarrel was composed. The priests were handed over, as an exceptional measure, and to the representative of the King of France instead of to the Papal agent; the excommunication and interdict were revoked without any request to that effect having been made by the Venetian government (1607). Soon after this the Grand Duke Ferdinand of Tuscany was succeeded by his son Cosimo II (1609–1621), who, notwithstanding the might of Spain, continued to pursue his father's policy.

Henri IV thought to resume the policy of equilibrium and expansion against the Habsburgs in Germany, and in April 1610 he concluded with Charles Emmanuel the Treaty of Bruzolo (near Turin), by which the duke, in the event of victory, would obtain the Milanese—excepting Cremona, which was reserved to Venice—and Monferrato, together with the title of king, while Henri IV had hopes of obtaining Savoy in exchange. But shortly afterwards—in May—Henri IV was assassinated by a Catholic fanatic, and the regent, Marie de Medici, allied herself with Spain.

Charles Emmanuel I, having vainly attempted to form a league

with Venice and the Pope, had to send one of his sons to Madrid to make his apologies. The death of Duke Francesco of Mantua (1612), who left a little daughter, the child of a daughter of Charles Emmanuel, induced the latter to intervene in the succession, reviving the old claims of his house upon Monferrato, which he invaded, demanding that his grand-daughter should be committed to his care. The late duke's brother, Ferdinand, assumed the succession himself, resigning his cardinalate, and he was supported by Venice, Tuscany, France and Spain. The Governor of Milan proceeded to attack the duke (1614), but was repeatedly repulsed. By the terms of the agreement of Asti (June 1615) the two adversaries were to have disarmed, referring the controversy in respect of Monferrato to the Emperor, but since the Governor of Milan did not disarm, the duke followed his example and resumed hostilities. Voices were raised in Italy (among the literati rather than the politicians) which greeted the duke as the champion of Italian independence.

The Hispano-Savoyard conflict was now merged with an Austro-Venetian conflict, which was occasioned by the Uscochi or Uskuks, a people inhabiting Slavonia and Serbia, who, fleeing from the Turks, had taken refuge in Dalmatia, where they exercised the trade of piracy in the Adriatic, under the protection of Austria. The republic, suffering from their incursions, blockaded the whole of the coast inhabited or frequented by the Uskuks. Austria opposed the blockade, and war ensued (1615). Now one side, now the other appeared to be gaining; for a time the Venetians occupied almost the whole County of Gorizia, and the Austrians made repeated inroads into Friuli. Confronted with the menacing attitude of the Spanish Governors of Milan and Naples, Venice entered into a league with Savoy and Holland. Duke Charles Emmanuel once more invaded Monferrato, and Gradisca was besieged for the second time by the Venetians; but France intervened, threatening to join with Spain, and Venice accepted the Peace of Madrid (September 1617). The Archduke Ferdinand undertook to destroy the fleet of the Uskuks and to deport the Uskuk population into the interior; Venice returned what she had conquered. In the case of Monferrato the previous treaty was observed.

The so-called "conspiracy of Bedmar" may be regarded as a result of the Hispano-Venetian quarrel. Bedmar was the Spanish ambassador to the Signoria. He was accused of complicity, together with the Governors of Milan and Naples, in the plot of certain French officers in the service of the republic to seize the city. But the Venetian government discovered the plot before it could be put into execution, and took measures for its repression (1618).

Venice was on particularly friendly terms with the bands of the Grisons, who occupied the Valtellina, which lay between the Milanese and Austrian territory, and was therefore a region of enormous military importance. The Grisons were Protestant; the population of the Valtellina was Catholic, and complained of oppression. On the 19 July 1620 the people of the Valtellina revolted, massacring as many Protestants as they could lay their hands on, and the governor entered the valley with a body of troops. A league was then concluded between France, Venice and Savoy, to restore the sovereignty of the Grisons in the Valtellina (1623); and the conflict in some way became merged in the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648), which had lately broken out in Germany between the Catholics and the Protestants. Charles Emmanuel I now cherished hopes of acquiring Genoa, an ally of Spain, as well as Monferrato and the Milanese. In conjunction with the French he occupied the whole Riviera di Ponente between Finale and Villafranca; but on the arrival of Spanish reinforcements the Hispano-Genoese forces ascended the valley of the Tanaro and in their turn invaded Piedmont. By the Peace of Monzon (between France and Spain, 1626) it was agreed that the Valtellina should be returned to Grisons, but it must have an autonomous administration, and only the Catholic faith must be practised.

Vincenzo Gonzaga having died in 1627 without leaving immediate heirs, the heir presumptive to the Duchy of Mantua was Charles Gonzaga, of the collateral French line of Nevers, who was supported by France and Venice, while Spain preferred the claims of Ferrante Gonzaga, Prince of Guastalla. The Duke of Savoy, who on the conclusion of the Peace of Monzon had been abandoned by France, now came to an understanding with Spain, who promised him a portion of Monferrato. The Emperor too was opposed to the claims of Nevers,

declaring that the fiefs of Mantua and Monferrato were vacant. The French pretender succeeded in obtaining possession of the territory, but Monferrato was invaded by Charles Emmanuel—who also vainly attempted to strike a blow against Genoa (conspiracy of Vachero)—and Casale was besieged by the Spaniards (1628). A French expedition under Louis XIII defeated the duke at Susa (March 1629), whereupon the latter entered into an agreement with France; and the siege to Casale was raised. But in the following year, when a new French army arrived, war was resumed between the duke and the French, who occupied Savoy, Pinerolo, and the Marquisate of Saluzzo. On the other hand, an imperial army, descending into Italy, entered the city of Mantua (18 July 1630), and for three days it suffered all the horrors of a sack.

On the 26 July Charles Emmanuel died of apoplexy, leaving his country exhausted by so many wars. He was succeeded by his son, Victor Amedeus I (1630–1637), who was again defeated by the French, while the Spaniards and Germans took Casale. Peace was concluded at Cherasco in April 1631. It acknowledged the succession of Nevers, while attributing Trino, Alba and other territories in Monferrato to the Duke of Savoy. France restored the occupied territories to the duke, but by a secret agreement obtained possession of Pinerolo and Perosa, which gave her a means of ingress into Italy. She then proceeded to contest the Spanish predominance in the peninsula, and in general to assail the power of the Habsburgs; the resumption of this active policy being due to Richelieu, the omnipotent minister of Louis XIII, the son of Henri IV. This policy was zealously supported by that of Savoy, which oscillated between the two great adjacent powers, seeking on every opportunity to derive some territorial advantage. The maximum programme was the acquisition of the Milanese, which might well be accompanied by that of a royal crown. And the only way to achieve this would be a war *à outrance* against the Habsburgs.

This possibility seems to have presented itself when France plunged straight into the Thirty Years' War, fighting the Habsburgs side by side with Switzerland. The Treaty of Rivoli (11 July 1635) was concluded by Victor Amedeus I, leagued with France, and also with

Mantua and Parma, the Duke of Savoy being promised the Milanese (except for Cremona, which was allotted to the Duke of Mantua), while certain Piedmontese valleys were to be ceded to France. The other Italian potentates adopted various attitudes. Venice maintained her usual neutrality; Modena finally sided with Spain; Ferdinand II of Tuscany (1621–1670), who had succeeded to his father Cosimo II, attempted without success to persuade the Pope to form a purely Italian league. This was Pope Urban VIII, a Barberini, a member of a Florentine family (1623–1644); in the great struggle between the Habsburgs and France he preserved a neutral attitude, while working for peace, and repudiating the Spanish theory, according to which he should have taken sides against France because the war was a war of religion. Hence his policy was on the whole more favourable to France than to her adversaries, and it was actually dictated by the desire to resist the preponderance of Spain.

In the Lombard war the victories won by the Duke of Savoy at Tornavento (1636) and Monbaldone (1637) did not lead to any noteworthy results. Parma withdrew from the league.

§ 95. INDIVIDUAL QUARRELS BETWEEN ITALIAN STATES. REVOLT IN NAPLES AND PALERMO.—In October 1637 Victor Amadeus died, and was succeeded by his son, Francesco Giacinto, a minor who died rather suddenly (1638). His successor was his brother Charles Emmanuel II (1638–1675). The regency of his mother, Christine of France (sister of Louis XIII, known as Madame Reale), was contested by the brothers of Duke Victor Amadeus—Cardinal Maurice and Thomas Prince of Carignan. Then followed a long, disastrous civil war between the “Principists,” supported by the Spaniards, and the “Madamists,” supported by the French; and the duchess was hard put to it to protect herself and the country from invasion by Richelieu. In 1692 the princes were reconciled with their sister-in-law, obtaining the government of certain cities. None the less, hostilities between the French and the Spaniards continued in Upper Italy, while another war had broken out in Central Italy—the War of Castro.

Urban VIII is distinguished in the history of the Papacy by a

reversion to the old "grand nepotism." Not only did he confer the cardinalate on three members of his family, which became excessively wealthy: he also conceived the notion of creating territorial *signorie* for his relatives. His nephew Taddeo was created Prince of Palestrina. Moreover, the Duchy of Urbino, which in the absence of male heirs to the Duke Francesco Maria della Rovere (*d.* 1631) lapsed to the Holy See, was simply annexed to the Papal domain. The Pope now began to covet the smaller fiefs of Castro and Ronciglione in Northern Latium, which were possessed by the Farnese. On the pretext of safeguarding the rights of the creditors of Odoardo Duke of Parma the Pope sent troops to occupy (1641) Castro and Montalto; then, as this step led to an embittered conflict, he excommunicated Farnese and proclaimed that he was deprived of all his fiefs, while Taddeo Barberini, with an army from the Bolognese, marched through Modena against Parma (1642). The duke, however, had the support of a league concluded between Tuscany (the Barberini and the Medici being enemies), Modena, and Venice. Taddeo retreated; and then the extraordinary military weakness of the Papal State became evident, for Barberini's army dispersed, and Farnese, following it up, was able to march as far as Lago Trasimeno and beyond. But since the duke's forces were wasted by defection, while the strength of the Papal army began to increase, Farnese—who was not supported by Tuscany—turned back to Parma. In the following year (1643) the league of the three powers made open war on the Holy See, the Tuscans attacking Umbria and the other confederates Ferrara; the Papal forces in turn attempted an attack on Pistoia and an invasion of Modenese territory. Finally, through the mediation of France, peace was concluded in Venice (May 1644), with the re-establishment of the *statu quo* between the belligerents, the absolution of the duke, and the restitution of Castro.

On the death of Pope Urban, which followed soon afterwards (July), he was succeeded by Innocent X (1644–1655), a Roman Pamfili, who was ruled by his sister-in-law, Olimpia Maidalchini. At first he was extremely hostile to the Barberini, and his troops occupied Palestrina; but then, as they enjoyed the protection of France, he restored their possessions, and since he coveted Castro, like his



predecessor, he made war upon Duke Ranuccio II, who had succeeded to Odoardo; this time the Farnese was isolated, Castro was taken and destroyed (1649), and was never restored to its rightful possessor.

The petty war that raged about Castro—typical of the nullity that characterized the politics of the Italian principalities—though it agitated the courts of Italy for years, was of no importance, and had no direct connection with the great European conflict between France and Spain. Not so the Neapolitan insurrection which took its name from Masaniello.

In the city of Naples ill feeling and rivalry had existed for some time between the nobles, who monopolised the *seggi* or "boards," and the people, represented by their *Eletto* (§ 91). Under the viceroyalty of Ossuna a Neapolitan jurist, Giulio Genoino, had made himself the champion of popular rights, and had found a supporter in the viceroy, who thought to increase the power of Spain by diminishing that of the nobility. But Ossuna, who was out of favour in Madrid, was recalled (1620), and Genoino lay for some time in prison. However, he had not forgotten his aims, and twenty-five years later an opportunity of realizing them was offered by the tumult which occurred amidst the Neapolitan populace in respect of the new duties, and above all the duty on fruit, imposed by the viceroy, the Duke of Arcos (December 1646).

Genoino secretly fanned the blaze; but the man who led the agitators in public was a very popular young fishmonger, Masaniello (Tommaso Aniello). On the 7 July 1647 there was a riot, the people shouting: "We won't have the duty; long live the King of Spain; death to misgovernment!" The royal palace was wrecked, the prisons were broken open, and the rebels armed themselves more effectively; they then declared that the object of the revolt was a popular constitution, based on an alleged privilege conceded by Charles V. The viceroy entered into negotiations with the populace, listened to their requests, and appointed Masaniello "Captain-General of the most loyal People" (11 July). Masaniello, however, suddenly developed symptoms of mental disorder, committing tyrannical actions and beheading people at random. Genoino and the other notables of the new popular government took measures for his arrest, but he evaded

them, and was killed by a group of conspirators in the convent of the Carmelites (16 July). The dead man was apotheosized by the people, and even by his slayers. For some time the power of government was exercised by Genoino, by agreement with the viceroy; but a new insurrection, in August, swept him aside (he died shortly afterwards, while he was being taken as a prisoner to Spain), and appointed the Prince of Massa generalissimo of the people. He too attempted to canalize the movement, and to keep it under the control of the Spanish rulers. In October there were further disturbances; Massa was killed; his place was taken by the armourer Gennaro Annese, and the republic was proclaimed (22 October 1647).

At this juncture various tendencies manifested themselves. Annese entered into negotiations with France, who agreed to take the rebels under her protection. Already, in 1646, a French fleet had appeared in Tuscan waters, carrying a landing force of troops under the command of Prince Thomas of Savoy (see above), who had taken service with the French, and had attacked the Presidi. Thomas aspired to the crown of Naples; another pretender was Henri of Lorraine, Duke of Guise, a descendant of the second House of Anjou. Guise now came to Naples, and succeeded in becoming elected as "Duke of the Republic" (24 December 1647). Under him the rebellion spread to various parts of the kingdom.

Spain, however, was still in possession of Castelnuovo, where the viceroy was residing (the Count of Oñate, who had succeeded to D'Arcos). He was assisted by the commander of the Spanish fleet, Don John of Austria, the natural son of Philip IV. Annese contrived to place himself at the head of the Spanish party, Guise was overthrown, and the rule of Spain was re-established. Annese, who now began to intrigue with the exiles of the French party, was hanged. Spain was able to retain Naples without an excessive display of force, as the French minister, Mazarin, who had succeeded to Richelieu, did not wish to involve himself too deeply.

Contemporaneously with the Neapolitan revolution another broke out in Palermo, where poverty and famine drove the people to revolt. The viceroy suppressed a first rising, whose leader, Nino della Polosa, was put to death. The rebellion was still smouldering when the news

of the rising in Naples made it break out afresh. The leader was a goldbeater, Giuseppe Alessi, who demanded that the privileges of the time of Pedro of Aragon should be restored, and the taxes abolished throughout the island. Unable to corrupt him, the viceroy and the nobles endeavoured to make him hateful to the people by declaring that he had sold himself to Spain, and during a further insurrection he was killed. The people, realizing the fraud that had been practised, sought to avenge his death, but in the absence of a leader they were vanquished. But peace was of brief duration. Insurrection followed upon insurrection; the last occurred at the end of 1649, the leaders being two eloquent advocates, Antonio Lo Giudice and Giuseppe Pesce; this conspiracy was denounced by the Holy Office, which in Sicily exercised the function of a secret police for the Spanish government, and they were killed.

In the Presidi also Spain, assisted by the Grand Duke of Tuscany, Ferdinand II, finally defeated the French expedition; and the French were expelled from Piombino and Portolongone, which were restored to Ludovisi, the heir of the Appiano (1650). The Duke of Modena went over to the French, and in Lombardy and Emilia there was a petty war between the Spaniards and the Franco-Modenese forces, which were joined by some Savoyard troops. But at last the Peace of the Pyrenees between France and Spain (1659)—the Peace of Westphalia had already (1648) put an end to hostilities between France and the Empire—set a term to these inconclusive operations in Italy, where all remained in *statu quo*.

But the question of Castro was still in suspense. The successor to Innocent X, Alexander VII (1655–1667), a Chigi of Siena, had refused to restore it to the Farnese, deliberately incamerating it in the patrimony of the Church. France intervened, already in conflict with the Pope on account of incidents which had occurred in Rome respecting the Corsican soldiers of the Papal guard and the ambassador of Louis XIV. By the Peace of Pisa (February 1664) the Pope undertook to disincamerate Castro on payment of ransom and to give satisfaction for the insults offered to the ambassador.

About this time there was a recrudescence of hostilities, after a long interval of peace, between Venice and the Turks, who made an

attack upon Crete. In the very long war that followed (1645-1669), while Canea was conquered almost immediately, they met with the most stubborn resistance in Candia, whose defence, continued for twenty years, made the name of Francesco Morosini famous. During the early years of the war the Venetians succeeded in retaining command of the sea, thus preventing the Turks from reinforcing the besiegers; a Turkish armada was burned near the ancient Phocaea (1649), and two others were destroyed by Leonardo Mocenigo (1651) off Paro and by Lorenzo Marcello (1656) at the entrance to the Dardanelles. Lazzaro Mocenigo, after a further victory, attempted to force the Dardanelles in order to make an assault upon Constantinople, but he was killed by gunfire from the two shores (1657). The Turks then recovered possession of the Archipelago, and the garrison of Candia, reduced to three thousand, without munitions, while the city was in ruins, was at last compelled to capitulate. Of the Turks a hundred thousand had perished. On the conclusion of peace the commercial relations between the two states were re-established.

§ 96. THE CULTURE OF THE COUNTER-REFORMATION AND THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.—With the end of the Renaissance and the growth of the Counter-Reformation, Italian culture lost the position of European predominance which it had held for two hundred years. In the Transalpine countries, and especially in those of Western Europe, the new cultures, emerging from the national soil, but inspired and fertilized by the civilization of the Renaissance, now began to develop in an exuberant and independent fashion, and little by little, reversing the original position, they acquired a preponderant influence over Italian culture. This autonomous development occurred in every sphere: in philosophy, philology, and science—mathematical, physical and natural—in letters, and the arts. Foreign influence was manifested sooner and more completely in the scientific sphere than in the domains of literature and art. In the sciences, whether intellectual or natural, Italy maintained a position of eminence until the first decades of the 17th century, while as the century wore on she was definitely outstripped by the rest of Europe. The great Italian writers of the Renaissance were still read and studied,

and the Italian language was still foremost among those which a cultivated person would wish to know. But the new Italian literature was attracting less and less attention, since it could offer no names which could compete with the great French writers (Montaigne, Corneille, Racine, Molière, La Fontaine, Bossuet, Fénelon), the Spanish (Cervantes, Lope de Vega, Calderón), or the English (Shakespeare, Milton). In respect of art, Italy, and Rome especially, were more than ever visited by those in search of instruction and inspiration: but these they obtained from the old masters, or the landscape and the ruins of antiquity, rather than from the new artists. Italian painters and sculptors of European fame and influence were becoming rare; architecture, however, retained a more prominent position, and the Baroque art of Italy became widely diffused beyond her frontiers.

The Italian literature of the whole of this period is characterized by the phenomenon of *secentismo*—that is, by a striving after an artificial mode of expression, which impressed the reader's imagination precisely because it was so unnatural. This phenomenon, however, was not solely Italian, but rather European; in Spain it took the form of a style full of conceits, and of "gongorism," so called after the poet Luis de Góngora; England had her Euphemism, so called after the didactic romance of *Euphues*, by John Lyly; while in France, at a later period—under Louis XIII—*précieusisme* took its name from *les précieuses* of the fashionable salons. But in these countries the tendency to artifice did not stifle the young and vital strength of the national literature, while in Italy it was overwhelming.

The principal representative of Italian *secentismo* was a poet of great ability, G. B. Marino of Naples (1569–1625: whence the term *marinismo*), whose poem, *Adone*, and his numerous lyrics, derived their form and their spirit from the pastoral poetry of the Cinquecento. A numerous school of lyric and idyllic poets followed the example of Marino. A more sober style was that of Gabriello Chiabrera of Savona (1552–1638), who, reverting to the imitation of Ronsard (§ 86), sought to create the Pindaric ode, succeeding best, like Ronsard himself, in the lighter and shorter type of ode. Fulvio Testi of Modena imitated Horace rather than Pindar, in moral and

political odes which were not without sincerity and true inspiration, the most notable of all being the enthusiastic odes addressed to Charles Emmanuel of Savoy. He was followed by Vincenzo da Filicaia (1642–1707), who won fame by his *canzoni* on the siege of Vienna (§ 97). The epic had become completely sterilized by its monotonous imitation of the *Gerusalemme liberata*. But Alessandro Tassoni of Modena (1565–1635) produced original work of artistic value, creating the heroi-comic poem with his *Secchia rapita*. And the well-known dithyramb, *Bacco in Toscana*, by the Aretine Francesco Redi (1626–1698), is full of vigorous movement.

A greater wealth of production is manifested by the prose of the period. Galileo Galilei (see later) expounded his scientific theories, for the most part in dialogue form, and he may really be called the creator of scientific Italian prose and one of the founders of modern Italian prose. Politics, history and religious oratory found illustrious exponents. Political speculations, which sought out new paths in the age of the Counter-Reformation, took its standards and its principles from moral speculation in the work of the Venetian Paolo Paruta (1540–1598): *Della perfezione della vita politica* (Paruta was the official historiographer of the Venetian Republic), and in the *Ragione di stato* of the Piedmontese Giovanni Botero (1540–1617): and it assumed an original form in the satirical *Ragguagli di Parnaso* of Traiano Boccalini of Loreto (1556–1613), a champion of liberty and an enemy of the Spaniards. History assumed a learned and critical form in the *Discorsi* of Vincenzo Borghini (1515–1580), who studied the origins of his native city of Florence, and in the *Storie fiorentine* of Scipione Ammirato of Lecce (1531–1601). The Oratorian Cesare Baronio (1538–1607) produced a Latin work, a stupendous compilation and elaboration of documentary material, the *Annales ecclesiastici* (from the birth of Christ to the end of the 12th century), which constituted one of the most powerful of Catholic weapons in controversies against the Protestants. The central fact of the Counter-Reformation was celebrated in a very different style by the Venetian Paolo Sarpi (1552–1623: § 94) and the Roman prelate, Sforza Pallavicino (1607–1667) in their histories of the Council of Trent; the French wars of religion were narrated by Enrico Caterino Davila of Padua (1576–

1631), and the wars of the Low Countries by Guido Bentivoglio of Ferrara (1579-1644), while the Jesuit Daniello Bartoli of Ferrara (1608-1685) recorded with moving eloquence the story of the missions of his confraternity in Asia. Religious oratory was the kind of prose most infested by *secentismo*, but it produced a powerful orator in Paolo Segneri of Nettuno (1624-1694).

The theatre is deserving of special notice. There were two characteristic kinds of drama in vogue. The first was the *commedia dell'arte*, in which the plot or "scenario" was evolved by the players themselves, by improvisation, the actors depending on the vast accumulation of general situations furnished by tradition, while the various types of character, recurring in all productions of the kind, were finally represented by "masks"—Pantalone, Arlecchino, Rosaura, Brighella etc. This kind of drama became extremely popular, and not only in Italy. The second kind was the melodrama,<sup>1</sup> resulting from the resurrection of the monody simultaneously with the polyphony of mediaeval sacred music, and the creation of the recitative (declamation in song). The first melodrama was the *Dafne* of Ottavio Rinuccini, set to music by Jacopo Peri (1594). This category of drama rose to great heights in the work of the composers Claudio Monteverdi (1567-1643) and Francesco Cavalli (1600-1676): but the melodramatic poem was soon completely subjected to the requirements of the composer, so that during the course of the 17th century it lost all artistic value.

The period of the Counter-Reformation was characterized at first by the triumph of the purest classicism in Italian art; but this classicism was cold and rigid in its systematic and theoretically planned achievements. The two greatest architects of the 16th century were also great theoreticians: Jacopo Barozzi (1507-1573), who took the name of Il Vignola from his native place in the Modenese, and Andrea Palladio of Vicenza (1518-1580). Subsequently the Baroque style evolved; which retained in substantial measure the architectonic ossature of the Renaissance, but allowed the most extraordinary developments of the decorative element, making this an aim in itself, and preferring broken lines or curves to straight lines, while in the interior of the churches it flaunted a dazzling wealth of ornament,

<sup>1</sup> The word is here used in its original and proper sense of musical drama. *Tr.*

until the structural lines were overlaid and lost (the "Jesuit style"). Nevertheless, the Baroque architecture, in the majesty of its proportions, its wealth of motives, and its feeling for the decorative and the picturesque, produced many masterpieces.

To this period belong Gian Lorenzo Bernini (1598-1680)—born in Naples, but residing in Rome—the architect of the colonnade of St. Peter's; Domenico Fontana (1543-1607: Lateran palace), Carlo Maderna (1556-1629: façade of St. Peter's), and Francesco Bonomini (1559-1667: church of Sant'Agnese in Rome), all of whom were Romans by training and adoption, if not by birth; and the Venetian Baldassare Longhena (1604-1682: church of La Salute and Palazzo Pesaro in Venice). It is to the architecture of this period that Rome owes many of her most characteristic aspects (Piazza San Pietro, Piazza Navona, Piazza del Laterano, Piazza del Quirinale).

Sculpture, which still persisted in imitating Michelangelo, produced a great deal of forced, insincere work. But the Baroque and the "Jesuit style" made their influence felt, contributing, in addition to a striving after movement and magnificence, the pathetic element, grace, and imagination. The greatest sculptor of the century was Bernini.

In painting too the influence of Michelangelo was predominant and equally pernicious. A new school of painting, the so-called eclectic school, which was based on the study of the greatest painters of the Renaissance, was the Bolognese school of the three Carracci (Ludovico 1555-1619, Agostino 1557-1602, and Annibale 1560-1609). It included also other notable painters, such as Domenichino (1582-1641), Guido Reni (1574-1642) and Francesco Albani (1578-1660). It revealed a profound knowledge of composition and decoration, but was essentially an academic school. An artist of great ability who reacted against the academic ideals was the Lombard Amerighi da Caravaggio (1573-1610), whose work was distinguished by its bold realism of types, and was full of violent contrasts of light and shade, whether it portrayed the traditional sacred subjects or episodes of real life. In the second half of the century Baccicia (1639-1709) is worthy of mention, and the Jesuit Andrea Pozzo (1642-1709), both of whom were famous decorators of the Roman churches, and also



a Neapolitan painter of landscapes and battle scenes, Salvator Rosa (1615–1673). Carlo Dolci, a Florentine (1616–1686), painted sacred subjects in a soft and languorous style.

The 17th century was *par excellence* the century of science; it was the period in which modern science was actually born, based on the inductive and experimental method, and above all on a mechanistic conception of Nature which replaced the animistic conception of the Renaissance. This profound revolution was initiated by Johann Kepler, the great German astronomer (1571–1630), who by repeated observations had succeeded in establishing his laws ("Kepler's laws") concerning the elliptical movement of the planets, which overthrew the old astronomy, based on the conception of uniform circular motion, and founded the modern science of astronomy. But the final triumph of experiment and the application of mathematics to natural phenomena was the achievement of Galileo Galilei of Pisa (1564–1642). Formulating the new method with a clear consciousness of its implications, he devised admirable means of applying it in the study of physical data, which enabled him to establish the fundamental laws of motion, and to lay the foundations of mechanics as the basic physical science; and also in the study of astronomical data. And here, thanks to the telescope, of which he was the first to make effective use, he made such notable discoveries as the rings of Saturn, and the satellites of Jupiter, and confirmed the Copernican system, dealing the final blow at the Aristotelean convention of a finite and immutable celestial universe. He expounded his scientific doctrine in admirable prose (see above), the *Dialogo dei massimi sistemi* (1632) and the *Dialoghi delle nuove scienze* (1636) being his most important works. But the abjuration of the Copernican system which was wrung from him by the Roman Inquisition (1633)—it had already been censured in 1616 as contrary to the Bible and heretical—and his condemnation to perpetual imprisonment, dealt a mortal blow to the liberty of science and to the initiative of the Italian scientists; and although courageous pupils of Galileo's—such as Evangelista Torricelli (1608–1647), the inventor of the barometer, and a distinguished innovator in hydraulics—saw to it that the method and the scientific traditions of the master were not abandoned, the fundamental constructive work

of the new science was not accomplished in Italy, but abroad, by Descartes, and Leibniz, and above all by Newton.

Science and philosophy continued to be closely inter-related. It was in the scientific sphere that the new anti-Aristotelean philosophy first made its appearance; it was therefore above all a natural philosophy. Its most eminent representatives were three Italians of the South: Bernardino Telesio (1508-1588), Giordano Bruno (1548-1600) and Tommaso Campanella (1568-1639). Telesio preached a philosophy opposed to Aristotelism, based on the experience of the senses, which replaced the "forms" of Aristotle, and the theory of the four elements, by the action upon matter of two opposing animate forces, heat and cold. Bruno drew from the Copernican system the extremer consequences; affirming the infinity of the universe, and connecting this with the infinity of God, he conceived the Divine being as the soul of the universe (pantheism). He affirmed the principle of the conservation and transformation of matter, and had an intuition of the law of inertia. Telesio's animistic notion of the two opposing forces of heat and cold is found again in Campanella, who conceived them as love and hatred. Better known is the political Utopia of his *Città del sole*, the title of a work in which he describes an ideal society, like that of Plato's *Republic*, guided by science and based on collectivism.

Campanella spent thirty years in prison, for political reasons (conspiracy against Spain) rather than religious; Bruno, condemned by the Roman Inquisition on a charge of heterodoxy, refused to retract, and was burned alive in Campo di Fiori. The imprisonment of Campanella, the burning of Bruno and the condemnation of Galileo marked the end of independent speculation in Italy. The country not only lost its intellectual primacy; it left the sphere of productive European culture and restricted itself to pure scholarship or scholastic logomachy. Modern thought survived and developed elsewhere. Modern philosophy received its impulse from Descartes, and when towards the end of the seventeenth century there was a revival of cultural life in Italy it was confined very largely to the sphere of philosophy and science, under the influence of Cartesianism, while in the field of erudition the supreme masters were foreigners; in particular,

the Benedictines of the French Congregation of St. Maurice (Mabillon).

§ 97. THE ITALIAN POLICY OF LOUIS XIV. VICTOR AMADEUS II.—Towards the close of the 17th century there was a revival of political life in Italy, provoked by the fact that under Louis XIV—after the successful termination of the war with Spain, and when the brief internal crisis of the popular and aristocratic insurrections in the Fronde (1648–1654) had been overcome, and the State had still further asserted its power in Europe against Spain, Holland and the Empire—France began to turn her attention to Italian affairs, with a view to acquiring preponderance in the peninsula.

We have already noted the first episode of this Italian policy of Louis XIV's—the conflict with Pope Alexander VII (§ 95). With Innocent XI (1676–1689), an Odescalchi—a rigidly ecclesiastical Pope, of exemplary morality and the enemy of all nepotism—Louis had more serious disputes, some touching the relations between the Gallican Church, the king, and the pontiff, and one respecting the temporal government of the Pope in Rome, in connection with the right of asylum claimed by the ambassadors, a source of serious inconvenience and a danger to public security, whose abolition had been accepted by the other powers, but not by France. The king and his representatives behaved in a most overbearing manner. The French ambassador was excommunicated, Avignon and Comtat-Venaissin were occupied by France, and the king appealed to a General Council (1687–1688). Under Alexander VIII the dispute was settled (1691), the French renouncing the right of asylum and restoring the occupied territories. Other instances of intervention on the part of Louis were more directly connected with the general political state of Italy, and more precisely with the struggle against Spain for preponderance in the peninsula. In 1674, France being then at war with a European coalition which included Spain, the Sicilian city of Messina rebelled against Spanish rule and placed itself under the protection of Louis XIV. There were various naval battles in Sicilian waters between French and Hispano-Dutch fleets, the French being victorious. But when Louis wanted to make peace he suddenly evacuated Messina,

abandoning the city to the vengeance of the Spaniards, apart from a few thousand citizens who found refuge on the French ships. The rebels were severely punished, and the city, deprived of all its privileges, fell into an extraordinary state of decadence.

The Peace of Nimeguen (1678-1679) concluded between Louis XIV and the coalition marked the zenith of the French king's influence. He now proceeded to extend and impose his power by a series of *coups de main* in Germany and Italy. On the same day (30 November 1681) Strasburg in Alsace was occupied, and the fortress of Casale in Monferrato, the last by agreement with the Duke of Mantua. In May 1684 Genoa was brutally bombarded for ten days by the French fleet because the Genoese had not obeyed the order to build no galleys for Spain. The Doge had to make submission and sue for pardon at Versailles.

Genoa had lost all political vitality. The Duke of Savoy hoped to take possession of the city by means of attacks from without and intrigues within. Charles Emmanuel made war upon Genoa in 1671-1673, but without result; peace was concluded through the mediation of Louis XIV. The contemporary conspiracy of Raffaele della Torre (1672), in which he acted in accord with the Savoyard government, failed in its object. The internal discontent was fomented by the character of the government—a closed oligarchy of the nobility, which rarely admitted to its ranks the new families which had achieved prominence by commerce or as landowners. The Duke of Savoy, Charles Emmanuel II (1638-1675), whose minority ended in 1648, did not actually rule until the death of his mother in 1653. His reign was a period of restoration and consolidation for the whole of Piedmont. He gave much thought to his army, but also to the condition of his people; in particular, he enlarged and embellished Turin, giving it the precocious aspect of a modern city. A very deplorable episode of his reign was the persecution of the Waldenses in 1655, which was accompanied by atrocities and massacres, the mountaineers defending themselves with their usual valour. The war was terminated by the intervention of the Protestant powers, among which was Cromwell's England. There was a less serious resumption of the persecution in 1663-1664.

Charles Emmanuel II was succeeded by his son Victor Amadeus II, under the regency of his mother, Marie Jeanne Baptiste of Savoie-Nemours (the French branch of the Savoyard house), who governed under vassalage to Louis XIV. This state of affairs continued for a year after Victor Amadeus had assumed the reins of government (1684). The duke found himself between the two French fortresses of Pinerolo and Casale; Louis XIV dictated laws to him, forced him to furnish troops, and urged him once again to take action against the Waldenses. (Louis had then abolished the Edict of Nantes, published by Henri IV, which assured the French Protestants of religious liberty.) Under the twofold Franco-Piedmontese attack the Waldenses, after offering a heroic resistance, were imprisoned, deported, or exiled (1686-1687); but in 1689 a group of them, setting out from the canton of Vaud, accomplished "*la glorieuse rentrée*" by a long march through all the Savoyard valleys (1689). Shortly afterwards Victor Amadeus, who was then at war with Louis XIV, became reconciled with them.

War having broken out between the League of Augusta (comprising the Empire, Spain, Holland and England) and Louis XIV, the duke began by offering Louis an alliance in exchange for part of the Milanese; but the king demanded the fortresses of Verrua and Turin as surety. Victor Amadeus then joined the League (June 1690); Catinat thereupon invaded and devastated Piedmont, and won a great battle at Staffarda, near Saluzzo (August 1690). Savoy and Nice were occupied by the French (1691). Reinforced by the imperialist general, Prince Eugène of Savoie-Carignan-Soissons, a grandson of Prince Tommaso (§ 95), Victor Amadeus won the upper hand; he was victorious at Cuneo (1691) and invaded Dauphiné. But an attack of smallpox, the guerilla warfare of the inhabitants, and French reinforcements compelled him to recross the Alps. Catinat, who had entrenched himself above Finestrelle—at Pra Catinat, as the place is called to-day—resumed the offensive, won a second great battle at Marsaglia, and captured Pinerolo (October 1693). In 1695, however, the French lost Casale, which reverted, by capitulation, to the Duke of Mantua. Negotiations followed between the duke and the king, and by the Treaty of Pinerolo (1696) the fortress, the outpost of French domina-

tion beyond the Alps, was restored to France. Thereupon, the allies refusing to recognize the neutrality which the duke had pledged in the name of all Italy by this treaty, Victor Amadeus joined the French; and then, the Empire and Spain acknowledging the pact, the war in Italy was ended (1696). The general war was presently terminated by the Treaties of Rijswijk, near The Hague (1697).

The Republic of Venice had taken no part whatever in the war of the League of Augusta, and it was henceforth definitely passive in respect of events in Italy. However, during this period it successfully resumed its overseas activities, obtaining its revenge against the Turks. The latter, in 1683, by arrangement with the Hungarian insurgents and Louis XIV, had marched upon Vienna, but the besieged city was saved by the victory of the imperial and Polish armies commanded by the King of Poland, Sobieski (1683). Venice joined the anti-Turkish alliance; her admiral, Francesco Morosini, occupied the Morea, Attica, and the cities of the Gulf of Corinth, and was greeted with the name of Peloponnesiaco (1685-1687). But the attempt to reconquer Candia failed. In January 1694 old Morosini died during a naval campaign; the Venetians, without making other permanent acquisitions, maintained their dominion of the sea. At the same time the Austrians drove the Turks out of Hungary and made other conquests. After Prince Eugène of Savoy's great victory at Zenta on the Theiss (1697), and when the French alliance was terminated by the Peace of Rijswijk, Turkey resigned herself to the Peace of Carlowitz (1699), which gave Hungary, Transylvania and Slavonia to Austria, and the Morea to Venice: a glorious but expensive victory, owing to the deplorable poverty and disorder of the province.

§ 98. THE COLLAPSE OF THE SPANISH DOMINION. THE SAVOYARD KINGDOM.—The maximum aim of Louis XIV's Italian policy was to take the place of Spain in her Italian dominions; and in this connection the question of the Spanish succession was opportune. Charles II (1665-1700) was the last of the Habsburgs of Spain, and he had neither sons nor other heirs male. The succession was claimed, by virtue of their matrimonial alliances with the Spanish Habsburgs, by the Bourbons of France and the Habsburgs of Austria, without

counting the other lesser pretenders, among whom was the Duke of Savoy (whose claim was made by virtue of his great-grandmother Catherine: § 94). Louis XIV repeatedly entered into agreements with the Great Powers as to the distribution of the spoil; he himself wanted the Two Sicilies. Charles II at last made a testament in which he appointed an heir: Philip of Anjou, younger son of the eldest son of Louis XIV; a disposition which the Emperor Leopold I opposed by the candidature of his younger son, the Archduke Charles. Louis XIV, abandoning the idea of partition, accepted the testament on behalf of his nephew, who in Spain was recognized without protest as Philip V. But certain actions of Louis' gave the impression that he did not intend to respect the division of the two crowns; and Leopold I succeeded in concluding an alliance (at The Hague, September 1701) with Holland and England. The latter power was fundamentally anti-French in policy, since Louis XIV favoured the restoration to the English throne of the Catholic Stuarts, as against the Protestant sovereign, William III of Orange (*d.* 1702) and Anne Stuart, and in the further line of succession, the House of Hanover. In May 1702 Holland, England and the Emperor declared war upon France. On the side of the French were Victor Amadeus II (Treaty of Turin, 6 April 1701), who held the supreme command in Italy, and Ferdinand Charles of Mantua.

Operations were begun in the Milanese even before the declaration of war, the Emperor having sent troops thither to recover this imperial fief, while Louis XIV had despatched others to defend it on behalf of Spain. Prince Eugène came down through the Vincentino, taking Catinat, who was guarding the valley of the Adige, by surprise, and crossing the Adige and the Mincio (summer of 1701). Catinat was replaced by Villeroi, whom Eugène defeated at Chiari (1 September 1701), afterwards taking him prisoner at Cremona (1 February 1702). The French position in Lombardy was improved by Vendôme, who in the presence of Philip V fought an indecisive battle at Luzzara in the territory of Reggio (15 August 1702). But the Duke of Savoy, displeased with Louis XIV, who could not make up his mind to promise that he should have the Milanese, opened negotiations with Austria. When the French realized this Vendôme disarmed and arrested

all the Piedmontese who were then in his army. The duke, although surrounded by the Franco-Spanish forces, declared war (7 October (1703)), and signed a treaty with the anti-French league (25 October), which promised him Monferrato, Alessandria, Lomellina, Valsesia and a number of provinces of Eastern France. The French occupied Savoy and Susa in the west, Vercelli and Ivrea in the east (1704).

Vendôme, while still occupying the territory of Victor Amadeus, had also to confront Prince Eugène, who had returned to Savoy, and he defeated him at Cassano on the Adda (16 August 1705), and at Calcinato, near Brescia 19 April (1706); but at this juncture he was recalled to Flanders, and the French, under La Feuillade, laid siege to Turin (May). In four months the city was reduced to extremities: the citadel was very nearly taken by a surprise attack, and was saved by the generous sacrifice of Pietro Micca. Victor Amadeus II, outside the city, waged a guerilla warfare, until Prince Eugène came to help him. Through the ineptitude of the French command the two forces were able to meet and look down upon the battlefield from the hill of Superga. Thereupon Victor Amadeus made a vow to raise the basilica which he afterwards built after the plans of Juvara, and the two armies attacked the besiegers, who were enclosed between their lines. The Battle of Turin (7 September 1706) ended in the complete rout of the French: Upper Italy was finally lost and evacuated by capitulation with the Emperor (13 March 1707). Victor Amadeus received Casale and the other territories as agreed. The Emperor occupied the Milanese and Mantua (the last of whose dukes died in the following year); and his troops, violating the Papal neutrality, marched upon the Napoletano—Naples having risen, on the 7 July, in support of Austria—and occupied it (August 1707).

In Italy, then, the arbitrament of arms had decided against France and in favour of Austria, while in Spain Philip V succeeded in holding his own against the Archduke Charles. The Archduke, after the death of his father Leopold, and of his brother, the Emperor Joseph I (1705–1711), would fain have united—like a new Charles V—the German and Spanish dominions; which made England and Holland inclined to effect a reconciliation with France. By the Treaties of



Utrecht (1713), to which the Emperor acceded, together with the Treaty of Rastadt (1714), Philip V formally renounced all rights to the French crown, obtaining Spain with the American colonies, and ceding to the Emperor the Low Countries (which were nearly equivalent to the modern Belgium) and the Italian dominions, with the exception of Sicily. Austria also annexed Mantua. Sicily went, with the title of king, to Victor Amadeus II; he also annexed Casale and all the rest of Monferrato, Alessandria, Valenza, Lomellina and Valsesia to Piedmont. France ceded to Victor Amadeus the valleys of Fenestrelle and Oulx, the remaining French possessions on the south of the Alps, receiving in return the valley of Barcellonette on the French side, and recognized the order of succession established in England.

The results of the War of the Spanish Succession were of great importance to Italy. Spanish rule was replaced by the Austrian, which was an improvement from the administrative point of view; but while in Lombardy the foreign dominion was extended by the annexation of Mantua—which was an important step towards the elimination of the petty states—in the south of Italy it suffered a substantial loss in Sicily, which was only somewhat diminished when this was replaced by Sardinia. The Savoyard state was enlarged and consolidated by its acquisitions in Piedmont, and was rid of the French occupation; while its union with a great Italian island which bore the title of kingdom made it the first power in Italy after Austria. But its success would have been much greater if, instead of the island kingdom, Lombardy had become subject to the House of Savoy.

Even in the War of the Spanish Succession the Venetian republic had remained neutral, although its territory was utilized by the belligerents as a thoroughfare and a field of manoeuvre, greatly to the disadvantage of the inhabitants. In December 1714 the Sultan made war upon Venice, for rebellious Montenegrins had taken refuge in Dalmatia, and the republic refused to surrender them. Unable for the time being to count on the assistance of any European power, the Venetians prepared for vigorous resistance. The Greeks of the Morea, restive under the government of the Venetian nobles, partly because they were even less tolerant than the Turks, began to side with the latter, facilitating their conquest. The inhabitants of the Ionian Islands, on the contrary,

fought heroically against the Turks, who, rapidly reconquering the whole of the Morea, proceeded to besiege Corfù (1716).

The alliance between Venice and Austria was now renewed (May 1716), and Turkey declared war upon Austria also. The war having been carried into Hungary, at Petervaradino Prince Eugène destroyed a Turkish army three times as numerous as his own (5 August 1716). A few days later the Venetians compelled the Turks who were besieging Corfù to re-embark in disorder. After further Austrian victories the Turks sued for peace. By the Treaty of Passarowitz (21 July 1718) Venice renounced the Morea, but retained the Ionian Islands, Butrinto, Prevesa, Marga and Vonitza on the Albanian coast; while Austria acquired large territorial gains in the Balkans.

## CHAPTER XVI

### *THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY*

§ 99. THE BOURBONS IN ITALY. THE NEW POLITICAL ORDER IN THE PENINSULA.—Spain, although she had acceded to the stipulations of the Treaty of Utrecht, did not easily resign herself to the loss of her Italian dominions; especially as the second wife of Philip V, the ambitious and intelligent Elisabetta Farnese, wished to constitute kingdoms for her sons in Italy. Philip V also aspired to act as regent in France for his nephew Louis XV (1715–1774), or even to succeed to the throne, although he had renounced his rights to it. The ambitions of the pair were encouraged by the shrewdness and activity of the minister Giulio Alberoni of Piacenza, an ecclesiastic who became a cardinal. Two Spanish expeditions in succession occupied Sardinia (1717) and Sicily (1718). But the quadruple alliance of England, Holland, France and Austria (Treaty of London, August 1718) compelled Philip to dismiss Alberoni and to capitulate. By the Treaty of The Hague (17 February 1720) Charles VI renounced all claim to Spain and the Spanish colonies, and Philip V all claim to Italy and the Low Countries; Austria took Sicily, which she had never ceased to claim, in the place of Sardinia, which went to Victor Amadeus II of Savoy. However, the Spanish Bourbons obtained something; the Duchy of Parma and Piacenza and the Grand Duchy of Tuscany were promised, on the proximate extinction of the Farnese and the Medici—neither princes nor people being consulted—to Don Carlos, the son of Philip V and Elisabetta Farnese. This disposition of the duchies was confirmed in successive treaties.

In January 1731 the last of the Farnese died—Duke Antonio. It was believed that his wife was enceinte, but then it was found that this was not the case. Thereupon imperial troops came to take possession of the duchy in the name of Don Carlos, the Holy See protesting in vain that its suzerainty was disregarded. In Tuscany the Grand

Duke Ferdinand II had been succeeded by his son Cosimo III (1670–1723), under whom the Medicean regime degenerated sadly into an ignorant and bigoted despotism. Cosimo's son, Gian Gastone (1723–1737), had ability, but when he succeeded to the throne he was already a sick and weary man, with an evil reputation, the consequence of his mode of life (he was homosexual). He had no children. By the treaty of 2 July 1731 he had to accept what the powers had arranged in respect of his state, to tolerate garrisons of Spanish troops in Tuscany, and (December 1731) to receive Don Carlos as his heir and act as his guardian during the prince's minority.

Two other European wars of succession followed the Spanish war in the first half of the 17th century, making substantial changes in the map of Italy. The first (1733–1738) was fought for the (elective) throne of Poland, when the candidate of the Polish national party, Stanislas Leszczynski, the father-in-law of Louis XV, who was supported by France, was opposed by the Austro-Russian candidate, Augustus III, Elector of Saxony, who triumphed over his adversary. France, defeated in the person of her protégé, and eager to revenge herself upon Austria, obtained the support of Spain, by promising the kingdom of Naples and Sicily to Don Carlos and the kingdom of Parma and Tuscany to his younger brother Don Felipe, and the support of Charles Emmanuel III, King of Sardinia (1730–1773), the son of Victor Amadeus II, by the promise of Lombardy. In Italy a Franco-Piedmontese army, under the command of the aged Marshal Villars and of Charles Emmanuel himself, entered Milan (3 November 1733) and occupied Lombardy, of which Charles Emmanuel styled himself the duke. The imperialists ventured an offensive in the following year, but were defeated by the Franco-Piedmontese at Parma (29 June 1734) and Guastulla (19 September), and compelled to shut themselves up in Mantua. In the meantime a Spanish army, which had disembarked in Tuscany at the end of 1733, entered the kingdom of Naples by way of Latium, meeting with only feeble opposition from the imperialists. On the 10 May 1734 Don Carlos made his solemn entry into Naples, acclaimed by the populace, who were glad to have a king of their own again. On the 25 May General Montemar defeated the Austrian army at Bitonto. By the end of the year the

whole of the Napoletano and Sicily were in the possession of Don Carlos.

In Germany too the war continued unfavourably for the Emperor Charles VI. However, in the preliminaries of Vienna (October 1735) he succeeded in concluding a peace of compromise, which was confirmed by the Treaty of Vienna (18 November 1738). Augustus III was acknowledged as King of Poland; Stanislas retained the title of king, and obtained the Duchy of Bar and Lorraine, which was to pass to France on his death, while Duke Francis Stephen of Lorraine, who in 1736 married Maria Theresa, was assigned, in exchange, the Grand Duchy of Tuscany, on the death of Gian Gastone, which occurred in 1737. Don Carlos received the kingdom of Naples and the State of the Presidi, while Charles Emmanuel III, in the place of Lombardy, acquired only Novara and Tortona and a number of imperial fiefs in the Langhe. Austria kept the states of Milan and Mantua and obtained Parma and Piacenza.

In the Treaty of Vienna of 1738 the recognition which the powers had already accorded to the Pragmatic Sanction was confirmed: this being the act of dynastic succession by which Charles VI had attributed the inheritance of the Habsburg territories, which were indivisible, to his direct descendants, even if female, and therefore to his daughter Maria Theresa. But when he died in October 1740 a number of rivals came forward to dispute the inheritance, in part or as a whole, and for various reasons, the chief of these being the Elector of Bavaria, Charles Albert, who also advanced his candidature to the Empire against Francis Stephen of Lorraine, the husband of Maria Theresa. Her enemies were then joined by Frederick II, King of Prussia (the Hohenzollern, Electors of Brandenburg, had assumed the royal dignity in 1701), who coveted the possession of Silesia, and opened hostilities by occupying it (December 1740). Now France concluded a league with Bavaria, Prussia and Spain (who now wanted Lombardy for Don Felipe, brother of Don Carlos); England alone supported Maria Theresa. Charles Albert of Bavaria was elected Emperor (January 1742) under the name of Charles VII.

In Italy Charles Emmanuel III at first adhered to the coalition against Maria Theresa; but afterwards, perceiving that the Spaniards

and the Neapolitans were preparing to invade the Milanese, he entered into an agreement with Maria Theresa to defend against the Bourbons the territory whose possession he coveted; and this alliance was confirmed by the Treaty of Worms (September 1743). The greater number of the Italian states declared themselves neutral; the King of Naples and the Duke of Mantua declared for Spain. In Italy, therefore, the war was fought between the Austro-Sardinian and the Franco-Spanish forces. An Austrian army attempted to invade the kingdom of Naples; but at Velletri, after an initial success, it was defeated by King Charles III (11 August 1744). In Upper Italy the war was fought with varying results. First the Austro-Sardinians occupied Parma and Modena; then the Franco-Spanish army invaded Piedmont, defeated the Austro-Sardinians at Bassignana on the Tanaro (27 September 1745), took Tortona, Asti, and Casale, and occupied Parma and Piacenza. On the 19 December 1745 Don Felipe made his triumphant entry into Milan. Charles Emmanuel began negotiations with France with a view to an agreement which would give Parma and Piacenza to Don Felipe and the Milanese to the House of Savoy; but the negotiations were broken off. The war being resumed, Piedmont was very soon rid of the Franco-Spanish troops, which suffered a serious defeat near Piacenza (16 June 1740), lost Lombardy, and re-crossed the Alps. The Austrian general, Botta Adorno, a Genoese by origin, with the co-operation of the British fleet took possession of Genoa, which had sided with the Franco-Spanish alliance (6 September). For four months the city had to suffer every kind of humiliating and arrogant behaviour from the conqueror; but finally one of the customary acts of provocation on the part of the Austrian soldiers provoked a popular rising—known as the insurrection of Balilla—and after five days of battle the Austrians were driven out (5–10 December 1746). The Austro-Sardinian army laid siege to the city, but at the news that the French were preparing to invade Piedmont Charles Emmanuel recalled his troops to oppose the invaders. The French descended from Mont Genève into the valley of Dora Riparia, but on the hill of Assietta they were driven back with very heavy losses (1747).

The defeat suffered by the French in Italy, which was not counter-

balanced by their success in the Low Countries, and the withdrawal of Bavaria from the conflict after the death of Charles VII—when Francis Stephen of Lorraine was elected to succeed him, under the name of Francis I (1745), thus beginning the line of Habsburg-Lorraine—and of Prussia, who retained Silesia, and finally the intervention of Russia on behalf of Maria Theresa, led to the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle (18 October 1748). In Germany the Pragmatic Sanction was confirmed and Francis I acknowledged Emperor. The King of Prussia, as we have seen, retained Silesia; in Italy Charles Emmanuel III obtained Voghera, Vigevano and the Upper Novarese, which advanced the eastern frontier of his state to the Ticino; Don Felipe de Bourbon became Duke of Parma, Piacenza and Guastalla, the Duke of Modena re-entered into possession of his territory, and Genoa recovered her independence and her suzerainty over the Marquisate of Finale.

If we compare the Italian map of 1748 with that of 1559 we find that foreign domination was reduced to the states of Milan and Mantua. An independent Kingdom of Naples and Sicily had emerged once more, under a branch of the Spanish Bourbons, who were rapidly becoming Italianized, or rather Neapolitanized. The Duchy of Savoy had become a kingdom, and was considerably enlarged. There was also, at this period, a gradual absorption of imperial fiefs and minor principalities by the larger Italian states. Saluzzo, Monferrato and the fiefs of the Langhe went to Savoy; Mantua, annexed by the Empire, was united to the Duchy of Milan; the Marquisate of Finale went to Genoa; Mirandola and Concordia (at the beginning of the 17th century) to the Duchy of Modena, which presently obtained the Duchies of Massa and Carrara, thanks to the marriage (1741) of Ercole Rinaldo d'Este with the heiress of the Malaspina-Cibo; between the second half of the 16th and the first of the 17th century the Grand Duchy of Tuscany absorbed the Counties of Pitigliano (Orsini) and Santa Fiora (Sdorza); and the Papal State incamerated Ferrara, Urbino and Castro.

This territorial concentration did not necessarily mean an increase of prosperity for the territories absorbed; in some important instances (Mantua, Ferrara, Urbino) one may say that it meant the contrary.

And the results of the other territorial exchanges were not all of a positive character. The Savoyard State, by rounding off its frontiers and even going beyond them, had lost its great political objective, the acquisition of Lombardy. This had passed under foreign rule; its government was better, but also stronger than that of Spain; the Empire, having incamerated Milan and Mantua as its fiefs, had in effect reaffirmed its suzerainty over Parma and Piacenza and Tuscany, and in a more general fashion over Italian affairs; and the Emperor himself governed Tuscany, through a government of its own, to be succeeded by a member of the imperial family. The republic of Venice was now deprived of all influence over Italian affairs, and had neither the desire nor the ability to combat or to balance the foreign power; indeed, its own territory had with impunity been violated by the belligerents. The same fate had befallen the Papal State, and to an even greater extent; it had lost the last vestige of political importance. In the Kingdom of Naples (as in Parma and Piacenza) the new dynasty was impelled by the closest dynastic ties to ally itself to Spain and follow her lead. In short, the capital fact was that the transformations which had occurred in the settlement of Italy were only in a very small degree the work of indigenous forces; once more the destinies of the peninsula had been decided by the foreign powers which had made it their battlefield. Nevertheless, on the whole the 18th century was for the Italian nation a period of real and marked recovery: though this was due less to the territorial and dynastic changes than to the economic and cultural revival. In the 18th century the spiritual life of Italy woke to new activity and returned to the ambit of the spiritual life of Europe. Since in the meantime this life had evolved independently of Italy, the Italians could not now escape its influence; and the principal phenomenon of this spiritual reawakening was the wide penetration of foreign culture. From this was generated a new national life, more closely joined to the life of Europe.

§ 100. THE EUROPEAN CULTURE OF THE "AUFKLÄRUNG."—The cultural transformation of the 18th century proceeded primarily from the spheres of science and philosophy, which were closely associated: literature was auxiliary and instrumental. The scientific thought



of the 18th century gathered up the legacy of the 17th century, and finally laid the foundations of modern science, in the positive and experimental observation of facts, and the deductions based on these facts, to the exclusion of aprioristic and transcendental explanations. The new thought was the triumphant offspring of empirical observation and mathematics. In the field of mathematics work of capital importance was done by Luigi Lagrange of Turin (1735-1813)—who found the ambient for his activities beyond the frontiers of the Savoyard state, in Prussia and France—in his *Mécanique analytique* (1788), a most admirable application of the abstract operations of mathematics to mechanics. The French mathematicians applied themselves more particularly to continuing the cosmological studies of Newton; and with Jean D'Alembert they founded the science of analytical mechanics. In astronomy, however, England held the first place (Bradley discovered the aberration of light; Herschel—a Hanoverian domiciled in England—discovered Uranus and developed the theory of stellar nebulae).

Physics made great progress, but here, until the period of the Revolution, Italy played no conspicuous part. During the century the thermometer, the lightning conductor and the steam-engine were invented. The progress of chemistry was more decisive: the founder of modern chemistry being the Frenchman Antoine Lavoisier (1743-1794).

The natural sciences co-ordinated and systematized the work done since the Renaissance. Foremost in this work of synthesis was G. L. L. Buffon (1707-1788), with his *Histoire naturelle*; while the Frenchman Haüy (1743-1822) was the creator of crystallography. The infusoria were studied by the Englishman Needham (1713-1781) and the great Italian naturalist Lazzaro Spallanzani (1729-1799), who also investigated the circulation of the blood, respiration, and digestion. Senebier of Geneva (1742-1809) gave proof of the respiration of plants; while the recognition of the sexuality of plants was largely due to the work of the great Swedish botanist, Linnaeus (1707-1778), the author of the binominal nomenclature. Medicine, having finally grown out of empiricism, was beginning to rationalize its methods. The Oriental practice of inoculation, introduced into England, led to the discovery of vaccination by Jenner (1796).

A characteristic of this period was the fusion of the sciences; thus the astronomer was usually a physicist and a mathematician, while physical science and biology were in close contact. This fusion, and the tendency to synthesis and generalization which marked the scientific activity of the period, find expression in the term "philosopher," by which the scientist was commonly denoted.

This philosophizing tendency of science was of great importance in the philosophical evolution of the 18th century, during which philosophy emerged from the restricted and segregated sphere of the specialists and became diffused throughout cultivated society, interesting itself in all questions of social importance. Its object was not so much to determine abstract truths of theoretical interest as to diffuse the knowledge acquired by scientific research and to draw the practical consequences therefrom. It tended therefore to affect the manners, laws and beliefs of society, thus becoming an immediate instrument of political and social evolution. This movement was known as "philosophism" or "Encyclopaedism" (from the *Encyclopédie Française*, of which more later), or the "age of enlightenment" (*Aufklärung*: the term "illumination," which has been employed in this connection, is equivocal and to be avoided). It was certainly promoted—but here we have little exact information—by Masonry, a secret society whose effective beginnings go back to the beginning of the 18th century, and which from England spread over the Continent.

If we attempted to summarize in a few lines the characteristics of this movement, we might say that in every sphere it endeavoured to transform ideas and institutions in accordance with principles determined by reason, as against the authorities hitherto recognized, and as against tradition, and traditional opinions, and historical contingencies. In philosophy it defended, as in the writings of the Englishman John Locke (1632–1704), the empiricism which derives all our knowledge from the senses and from reflection upon the data provided by them, to the exclusion of *a priori* concepts and innate ideas. In religion it opposed, more or less openly, the Christian dogmas, all forms of "revealed" religion, and ecclesiastical organizations, while defending natural religion—that is, the religion which is said to be fundamental in human nature: a religion which was described as Deism, inasmuch

as it recognized the existence of God, and also the immortality of the soul, while repudiating mysteries and miracles, and in general all that seems contrary to reason. Nevertheless, "philosophism" admitted the existence of the positive religions and the churches, and even of State churches, as practically necessary and socially useful; but it was especially insistent in its demand for religious tolerance. In the ethical sphere it stood for a natural and rational morality, which was in actual fact a social utilitarianism. In politics it recommended the elimination of the vestiges of the Middle Ages, and hence, of feudal privileges, class distinctions, etc., the equalization of bourgeoisie and nobility, the concentration of power in the hands of the State, in the place of the mediaeval subdivision of powers, the participation of the educated classes in the government of the country, and the administration of public affairs in the interests of the collectivity; in a word, what was called an enlightened government.

"Philosophism" was born in England; the offspring of movements whose sources are to be found in the 17th century. Locke may be regarded as its chief protagonist, in both the political and the religious sphere. A champion of liberty and democracy, he maintained that the truth of Christianity consisted in its harmony with reason, and did not attack dogmas, as did the Deists, or, as they styled themselves, the Freethinkers; of whom we may name Toland (1670-1722) and Tindal (1656-1733) as pre-eminent in their day. More radical conclusions, which sapped the very bases of Deism, were reached by David Hume (1711-1776), who, with an empiricism even more revolutionary than that of Locke, maintained that reason can tell us nothing concerning God and the immortality of the soul. Primitive religion, instead of being rational religion, is said to be derived from the feelings of the man who, intimidated by the powers of Nature, conceived Nature in accordance with his own imagination, thus creating polytheism. These radical tendencies did not gain the upper hand in England; nevertheless, their influence was very great.

In France the philosophism of the 18th century asserted itself more widely, and its radical tendencies were more efficacious. It derived its ideas from the Deism and empiricism of the English, but it was marked by a more definite leaning toward propaganda and practical

action, giving the English ideas a definitely anticlerical and anti-Catholic colouring. This movement may be summed up in three names: Voltaire, the Encyclopaedists, Rousseau.

François-Marie Arouet de Voltaire, in his long and extremely productive life as a writer (1694–1778), absolutely dominated the world of European culture by the facility of his style and his mordant wit. No one did more to diffuse English ideas (the science of Newton, the philosophy of Locke, Deism, religious tolerance, parliamentary liberty) on the Continent, particularly by his *Lettres sur les Anglais* (1734), a work which the French government ordered to be burnt; no one did more to propagate philosophism, especially by his typical *Dictionnaire philosophique* (1764). The whole of his immense literary output served to propagate the new ideas. In the *Siècle de Louis XIV* (1751), one of his more important works, and one of the greatest examples of French historiography, the only stain upon that glorious epoch, which Voltaire praises to the skies, is shown to be the intolerant Catholic policy of Louis XIV. The cult of reason and humanity and civilization, and hatred of dogma and of the Church, are the leading motives of his famous *Essai sur l'Histoire générale et sur les mœurs et l'esprit des nations* (1753–1738), a philosophical compendium of world-history, which marked an epoch in modern historiography, above all because it replaced the politico-bellucose type of history by the history of cultures and ideas. The tragedies which made him predominant in the French theatre are informed with the same ideas. But his most effective works of propaganda were his little brochures, fables, romances, dialogues, etc.

Voltaire denied the validity of all the positive religions, which for him were based on the lies of the priests and the credulity of the populace. He believed in the existence of God and of a moral order, suggested by the reason; but he denied the existence of a divine Providence, or at all events, he denied its omnipotence. In practice he did not wish to abolish the religions, holding them to be necessary to the people; but he demanded religious tolerance. This was one of the points upon which he was most insistent, and in respect of which he exerted the greatest influence over public opinion. Politically he recommended an enlightened absolutism; the monarch and the upper

classes, "les honnêtes gens," ought to govern in the common interest. Voltaire's exceptionally brilliant gifts as a writer and popular propagandist gave him an extraordinary influence over his period, so that he contributed more than anyone to liberate European thought from the fetters of religious authority and tradition.

The new political ideas were still further developed by Charles de Montesquieu (1689-1755). In his *Lettres persanes* (1721) he subjected despotism to the sharpest criticism; in *Considérations* (1739) he investigated, with acute political vision, the causes of the greatness and decline of Rome; in the *Esprit des lois* (1748) he subjected the legislative systems of the various peoples to a comparative examination, investigating the principles of their formation and evolution in the moral and physical environment. An admirer of the British Constitution, he preached the separation of the three powers, legislative, judicial and executive—the fundamental idea of modern constitutionalism.

The philosopher (in the technical sense) of French enlightenment was Etienne de Condillac (1715-1780), who derived the whole content and activity (attention, judgement, conception) of the mind from sensation, understood as the impression which the mind receives passively from the outer world. The "sensationalism" of Condillac became the European philosophy of the 18th century; Condillac, however, admitted the distinction between *anima* and *materia*, but there were those who went much farther, conceiving matter as the sole reality. Materialism has its "Bible" in the *Système de la nature* of Baron d'Holbach (1723-1789), a German living in Paris.

Denis Diderot (1713-1784), who with Voltaire and Rousseau was one of the most important of the French philosophers of the 18th century, and who of the three was the most profoundly and widely cultivated, was also a materialist, but his boldest ideas were expressed in writings which he did not publish. His name and his influence were associated mainly with the *Encyclopédie* (1751-1780), of which he was the promoter and director, in conjunction with d'Alembert (see above), his collaborators being Voltaire, Montesquieu, Condillac, Buffon, etc. In its thirty-five volumes the work contains, in the form of an alphabetical dictionary, a compendium of human knowledge; and with all

the diversity, the contradictions and the skilful adaptations of the contributors, it was a tremendous manifesto on behalf of philosophic thought as against the old ideas of the past.

Standing aloof from the Encyclopaedists, and even opposed to them in many respects, was Jean-Jacques Rousseau of Geneva (1712-1778). The whole of his work was based on the conception of the conflict between Nature and society: Nature had made man good, free, and happy; society had made him wicked, slavish and miserable. In the *Discours sur les sciences et les arts* (1750) he denied that the evolution of society had led to moral improvement; in *Discours sur l'origine de l'inégalité parmi les hommes* (1755) he maintained that social life had led to the multiplication of needs, to egoistic conflict and poverty, and had given rise to the fundamental evil of inequality and individual property. To return to the primitive state is impossible, and in certain respects the civilized man is superior to the primitive man. But the goodness and happiness which were peculiar to primitive man can and must be restored in ourselves. This work of restoration can be accomplished in the individual by an education which will allow him to develop freely in accordance with Nature (*Emile*, 1762); in the family, by basing it on the love of husband and wife and children (*Nouvelle Héloïse*, 1761); and lastly, in society by re-establishing the relations between the State and the individual which are dictated by the social contract (*Du contrat social*, 1762). Rousseau, that is, imagined that society and social authority had arisen because every human being had abdicated his individual will in order to subject himself to the will of all, for the benefit of all; the power of the State, therefore, derived from the collectivity, presupposed the equality of individuals, and ought to be administered in their interest; in the contrary case its legitimacy disappeared, the contract was dissolved, and the individuals recovered their liberty.

The nexus and the basis of Rousseau's ideas was the religious idea. God made man naturally good; God could make him become good once more. The "profession of faith of the Savoyard vicar" in *Emile* maintains the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, and Providence. Here we have what is substantially the Deistic conception; but in Rousseau's case it was not an abstract affirmation and a rational

deduction, but rather a product of the intimate life of sentiment. Rousseau felt that God was in man as an integrating and fundamental part of life. For him, the essential basis of morality was the religious sentiment.

Voltaire dominated the age of Louis XV; Rousseau paved the way for the Revolution. One may say that the evangel of the Revolution was his *Contrat social*.

It was not only the philosophers of France who diffused new ideas and recommended bold reforms; for an important part was played by the economists, of whom the most notable were the so-called physiocrats. The physiocratic school, which emerged between 1750 and 1770, set out from philosophical principles which were akin to those of philosophism. They conceived society as resulting from a contract between individuals, all having the same natural rights; a contract whose purpose was to restrict the liberty of each in so far as it was incompatible with the rights of others. The intervention of the State was to be limited to this function; it would leave property, labour and commerce absolutely free; there would be no monopolies, no privileges. The physiocrats therefore reacted against the so-called mercantilism; that is, against the industrial protectionism which had been in force during the preceding period. For them the industries, commerce, and the money in circulation did not constitute true wealth; for wealth was provided only by Nature—that is, by the soil, by agriculture, and the best means of stimulating the production of agriculture was free trade and free competition.

The theories of the physiocrats had a great deal of influence, not only in the theoretical domain, but over the governments of states. The Scotsman Adam Smith (1723–1790) reacted against their too exclusive point of view, and it may be said that his *Inquiry into the nature and the causes of the Wealth of Nations* laid the true foundation of political economy. He demonstrated that the real producer of wealth is labour, and undertook a searching analysis of the concepts of labour, price, capital, and the laws of demand and supply which regulate the variations of prices, and he reaffirmed the principle of free competition.

§ 101. THE REVIVAL OF ITALIAN CULTURE.—Among the countries which were most strongly affected—though as regards a very small circle of intellectuals only—by the influence of philosophy (particularly by that of Voltaire and the Encyclopaedists, and in a much less degree by that of Rousseau) was Italy, which in the second half of the century made notable contributions to the movement; not in the domain of speculation and philosophico-religious polemic, but in the sphere of social and political economy. In economy the Italians were to some extent the forerunners of the physiocrats, and to some extent they were influenced by them. We may mention G. B. Vasco (1733–1796), who was opposed to the corporations and favoured free trade; G. Rinaldo Carli (1720–1795); and above all Antonio Genovesi (1713–1769), who was a professor of commerce, and who recommended the free circulation even of cereals; and Ferdinando Galiani (1728–1787), who criticized the physiocrats, recommending a variable economic policy in accordance with circumstances. Another writer on economy was the Milanese noble Pietro Verri (1728–1797), the editor of the journal *Il Caffè*, a free trader and a physiocrat who tempered the exaggerations of the school; he also attempted to define the concept of money. He gave much attention to the administrative and political conditions of the Milanese, recommending reforms which were inspired by the humanitarian and utilitarian criteria of the political thought of the time. In his later years, under the influence of the French Revolution, he wrote in praise of constitutional institutions. He also examined the penal laws, demanding the abolition of torture; but in this domain the most famous work was that of the Milanese writer Cesare Beccaria (1738–1794): a little book entitled *Dei delitti e delle pene* (1764), in which a radical reform of the penal law and procedure was recommended, based on the criterion that punishment ought not to be vindictive in character, but merely a measure of social defence: he therefore demanded uniformity of procedure, the mitigation of penalties, and the abolition of abuses (clandestine accusations, arbitrary imprisonment, secret trials); torture and the death penalty were inadmissible. Beccaria also studied agriculture and economy, and was one of the first to appreciate the work of Adam Smith. Another writer deserving of mention is Gaetano Filangeri (1757–1788), who as a very



young man wrote the mighty *Scienza della legislazione*, based entirely on the principle that all things should be done in accordance with the principles of philosophy.

In the first half of the 18th century Italy produced a thinker of great originality in G. B. Vico (1668–1744), who in addition to criticizing the ideas and institutions of the period, and suggesting programmes of reform, turned his attention to the purely theoretical investigation of historical data and the objective understanding of their inherent laws. In his *Scienza nuova* (1725–1744) he attempted to trace the great outlines of the history of humanity, elucidating it (with muddled erudition and unsound criticism, but with great acuteness of intuition) by the examination of language, poetry, mythology, and law, and finally distinguishing three epochs: that of the gods, that of the heroes, and that of man; which epochs, according to his theory of occurrence and recurrence, were successively reproduced in the vicissitudes of human society. Vico, while to some extent he was a precursor of the philosophy and history of the 19th century, stood outside the tendencies and necessities of his time, so that he had no influence over his contemporaries.

In the domain of history the Italy of the 18th century produced some notable work, of great and lasting influence, in respect of the collation and criticism of data and documents, in accordance with the positive tendency of the period. First in this field was L. A. Muratori (1672–1750), author of the great collection of *Rerum italicarum scriptores*—that is, of the sources for the history of Italy in the Middle Ages and of the *Annali d'Italia*, which summed up the results of his researches in a historical narrative extending from the beginning of the historical era down to the year 1749; the story is quickly and simply but vividly narrated, and its spirit is definitely progressive and humanitarian. The same thing was done for the history of Italian literature by Apostolo Zeno (see later) and above all by Gerolama Tiraboschi (1731–1794), in his *Storia della letteratura italiana*. Luigi Lanzi (1732–1810) made a beginning in the history of the arts with his *Storia pittorica d'Italia*. A conception of history differing from the traditional conception—which was rhetorical and moralizing—was expounded by Pietro Giannone (1676–1748), who in his *Storia del Regno di Napoli*

traced the evolution of political and religious institutions in accordance with an anti-ecclesiastic and anti-monarchical theory, thereby furthering one of the leading political tendencies of the time (§ 102).

A new form of literature was the journal. First appearing in the middle of the 16th century, in the shape of notices written by hand, it had been further developed during the 17th century; and in addition to the sort of journal which was a medium of political information there emerged the erudite and academic periodicals which published, in addition to original memoirs, summaries or reviews of new Italian or foreign books. A model of this type of periodical was the *Giornale dei letterati d'Italia*, edited for some years by Zeno. The 18th century, following the example of England, produced a new type of journal, in which scholarship was replaced by the exposition and discussion of general ideas and arguments, intended for the ordinary public. A journal of this type was *Il Caffè* (1764-1766), published in Milan, and largely the production of Pietro Verri: an organ of the new rationalistic and reforming tendencies, which gave much attention to literary criticism, condemning the traditional "classicism" and pedantry in favour of a new, changing, vital literature, though it did not escape the danger of stridency and a linguistic Gallicism. Literary criticism had a great vogue, and especially worthy of mention is the *Frusta letteraria* (1763-1764) of Giuseppe Baretti, who made war upon "Arcadia," calling for a literature based on the observation of human reality, nourished with facts and serving the purposes of life, and for a prose which should be supple, easy, and modern, yet without linguistic impurities. A third periodical, which was devoted mainly to depicting the morals of society, not without touches of amiable satire, was the *Osservatore Veneto* (1761-1762) of Gaspare Gozzi.

Literature also, properly so called, underwent a great transformation during the 18th century. Profoundly modifying the rhetorical traditions which had begun to take shape in the Renaissance, to become crystallized in the 17th century, it finally created new forms which were better able to express the opinions, feelings and needs of the times, making a closer approach to life.

The passage of Italian poetry from the 17th to the 18th century was marked by the foundation of "Arcadia"; that is, the literary

movement promoted by the Roman academy of this name, whose aim was to make an end of "Secentismo" ("seventeenth-centuryism"). "Arcadia," however, which was founded in 1690, made its appearance when "Marinism" had already been outlived. Its intention was to regenerate Italian poetry, replacing the flatulent style of the 17th century by simplicity and a pastoral naturalism; but, as will be readily understood, it actually substituted a new artificiality for the old. A verse-form especially beloved by the Arcadians was the *canzonetta*, which was cultivated with truly exquisite grace by Paolo Rolli (1687-1765) and Pietro Metastasio (see below). Another Arcadian, on the contrary, Carlo Innocenzo Grugoni (1692-1768), who preferred the more bombastic and magniloquent forms, brought unrhymed verse into fashion as a lyrical medium. On the whole, Italian lyrical poetry gave no unmistakable signs of new life during the first half of the century; while the poem of chivalry "died in a burst of laughter" with the *Ricciardetto* of Nicolò Forteguerri (1674-1735), in which the old material of the poems of chivalry was parodied and caricatured.

The melodrama (music-drama) and the comedy, however, entered upon a new lease of life. The first of these forms, which had fallen very low during the 17th century, having become the servile instrument of every kind of theatrical and musical extravagance, was raised to the dignity of a work of art by Apostolo Zeno (1668-1750), reaching the summit of perfection in the work of Pietro Metastasio (1698-1782), whose *Didone abbandonata*, *Catone in Utica*, *Clemenza di Tito*, *Temistocle*, and *Attilio Regolo* call for mention. Metastasio, taking the incidents and traditions of classical antiquity as his material, transformed it in such a way as to adapt it to the taste and the temper of the period, constructing amorous intrigues and depicting languid and sentimental passions, expressing himself in fluent verse of exquisite literary form, which was at the same time perfectly adapted to the music. His melodramas were substantially representations of the sentiments and manners of the period.

A more lively, direct, and varied representation of contemporary life was given by the Venetian Carlo Goldoni (1707-1793). He contrived, little by little, to replace the *commedia dell'arte* by the regular

literary comedy; which, however, unlike that of the 16th century, was not a more or less free imitation of the classic comedy, but a direct expression of everyday reality: in the first place of the life of Venice, with its characters, its manners, and its amiable satire. We will mention only the *Bottega del Caffè*, *La Locandiera*, *I Rusteghi*, *Un curioso accidente*. Representing the society of his time, Goldoni infused a breath of fresh life into the exhausted literature of Italy. However, he belongs essentially to the world of the 18th century which was to pass away with the Revolution, even though he had some presentiments of the new age which actually made its appearance with Parini and Alfieri.

Giuseppe Parini (1729-1799), from Bosisio in Brianza, a priest of liberal opinions, who, starting from "Arcadia," lifted himself above it and renewed the lyrical poetry of Italy with his *Odi*, in which he sought to express sincerely personal sentiments and noble civic and moral ideals; poems in which the vigorous form and varying metre go hand in hand with the firm and coherent structure of the composition. But Parini's masterpiece is *Il Giorno*, which in *vers libre*, handled with admirable skill, gives us a shrewd representation, touched with exquisite irony, of the idle and useless life of a great proportion of the nobility of that period; telling us, as the poet instructs his "giovine signora," how the nobility employ the day, and contrasting this employment with the varied life of the poor and laborious people. With *Il Giorno*, which was divided into four parts (*Mattino*, *Mezzogiorno*, *Vespro*, *Notte*), the first of which was published in 1763, modern Italian literature had really made a beginning.

Vittorio Alfieri (1749-1803) was the first poet to give Italy a great tragic drama, in which the influence of French tragedy is evident, but which is nevertheless the expression of a strong personality. His tragedies, of which we may mention *Filippo*, *Agamennone*, *Oreste*, *Virginia*, *Mirra*, *Saul*, and *La Congiura dei Pazzi*, are notable no less for their literary form, whose rugged strength marks a vigorous reaction against "Arcadia," for the structural solidity of the drama, and the significance of the characters, than for their political ideals, their love of liberty and hatred of tyranny, which find expression also in the writer's prose works (*Del Principe e delle Lettere*, *Della Tirannide*). These, more

definitely than Parini's work, express the spirit of the French Revolution, and are inspired by noble and patriotic emotion.

Prose also contributed to the renewal of Italian literature. Scientific prose continued the glorious tradition of Galileo and Redi in the work of Lorenzo Magalotti (1637-1712) and the naturalist Lazzaro Spallanzani (§ 100).

Turning to art, whether in Italy or abroad, we find that in the 18th century, and more particularly in the epoch of the Regency, and the first half of the reign of Louis XV, the period of Baroque was followed by that of "Rococo" art. This name is given to a style which instead of strong, clear lines prefers airy and capricious curves, overlapping contours, and a decorative profusion of garlands, festoons and scallops; while bold tones and deep shadows are replaced by vague, rosy tints.

The Rococo style was especially marked in the decoration of furniture—in what was known as the Louis Quinze style—and it dictated to Europe the laws of decorative art. An art which contributed and adapted itself to the diffusion of this style was the designing and decoration of porcelain, a material introduced long before this from China, and which was now manufactured in Europe, thanks to experiments made in Italy in the 16th century. The French porcelain (Sèvres) became famous in the second half of the 18th century. But the influence of the new style was felt also in larger works of art, as in the French hôtels of the 18th century.

Italy had now yielded the lead to France in respect of the development of art, but she was still, by virtue of her past, the supreme school of art. Architecture was more faithful to the tradition of the 17th century, and was still producing very fine work, such as the Fontana di Trevi, by Nicolò Salvi (1694-1751), the steps of Trinità dei Monti (1721-1724), by Specchi and de Sanctis, the principal façade of St. John Lateran, by Alessandro Galilei (1691-1737), and the façade of Santa Maria Maggiore, by Ferdinando Fuga (1699-1780). An architect who was master of a severer style was Filippo Juvara (c. 1676-1736), the creator of the Tempio di Superga, while Luigi Venvitelli (1700-1773), in the royal palace of Caserta, introduced the long façade characteristic of the French palaces.

Italian painting produced a very notable artist in G. B. Tiepolo (1696-1770), who reverted to the traditions of the Venetian school, but developed them in his own way, with a vigour of movement and a decorative value which were personal to himself. Other Venetian artists who cannot be overlooked are the two Canaletto (Antonio Canale, 1697-1768, and Bernardino Belotto, 1720-1780), who painted many fine views of their city, and Francesco Guardi (1712-1793), whose paintings of Venice are unique in their originality and modernity. In the work of Pompeo Batoni (1708-1787), on the other hand, we see a return to Italian "classicism." The reaction against the affected gallantry which was so triumphantly expressed in the paintings of Watteau, Boucher and Fragonard was evoked by the study of archaeology and of classic art, inspired by the labours of the German Winckelmann (1716-1768), who studied and wrote in Italy. His principal work, the *Storia dell' Arte nell' antichità*, enjoyed enormous success, in France and Italy no less than in Germany. Throughout Europe it directed people's attention to the art of antiquity, and the general interest was increased by the first important discoveries at Pompeii and Herculaneum, which were made in 1735, and the innumerable views of Roman monuments produced by the great Roman engraver, Antonio Piranesi (1720-1778). The taste for the antique found expression more particularly in the decorative arts, in the so-called Empire style, which had actually become fashionable before Napoleon's time. In painting it had its triumphs in the work of Louis David (1748-1825), an exponent of the strict and exclusive imitation of the classics, enlivened by a breath of enthusiasm for the civic and moral virtues of antiquity. As early as 1784 his painting of "The Oath of the Horatii" constituted a triumphant example of the new movement.

In Italy neoclassicism began to show itself in architecture in the work of Giuseppe Piermarini (1734-1808), the architect of the La Scala theatre in Milan; and above all in sculpture, in the work of Antonio Canova (1757-1823), who devoted himself entirely to the reproduction of the forms and proportions of Greek sculpture, which he did in a pleasantly academic style. His work, however, belongs rather to the following period.

In the 17th century, but still more in the 18th century, the art of music underwent such remarkable developments that it became an important element of European culture. We have seen that the music-drama had its origin in the Florentine school of music (§ 96). The oratorio was evolved at the same time (Emilio de Cavalieri, *Rappresentazione di anima e di corpo*, 1600). After Monteverdi and Cavalli (§ 96) the music-drama was given its characteristic form by Alessandro Scarlatti (1659–1725), the founder of the Neapolitan school (Durante, Porpora). In the music-drama of this school the preponderance of the recitative was replaced by the absolute dominance of the melody (the aria), which finally enslaved not only the poet, but even the composer himself, for it became the field reserved for the virtuosity of the singers. Apart from serious music, the 18th century saw the rise of *opera buffa*, whose most distinguished exponents were G. B. Pergolesi (1710–1737: *La Serva padrona*) who was also the composer of a famous *Stabat Mater*; Giovanni Paisiello (1741–1816: *Il Barbiere di Siviglia*); and Domenico Cimarosa (1749–1801: *Il Matrimonio segreto*). The Florentine G. B. Lulli (1632–1687) founded the French opera in Paris, in which the chorus and the ballet were of great importance, while the melody was more sober in character and more in keeping with the words. But a decisive reformation in this respect was effected by Christoph Gluck (1714–1787: *Orfeo*, *Ifigenia in Aulide*), who laid down the fundamental principle that the music of an opera must say what is said by the text of the libretto, and must therefore be subordinated to the latter. Gluck was a German, and Germany was now contending with Italy for musical primacy, and taking the first place in respect of sacred music and the symphony. In the 16th century Italy had had a very great composer of sacred music: Pier Luigi da Palestrina (1525–1594), and she produced other distinguished composers at a later period (for example, Benedetto Marcello in the 18th century), although in theatrical music she was forced to take second place. In Germany theatrical music developed from the chorale, which flourished greatly under the impulse of the Reformation. In choral music (oratorios, cantatas, masses) the supreme figure was Johann Sebastian Bach (1685–1750), one of the greatest of musical geniuses. Contemporary with him was Georg Friedrich Handel (1685–1759),

whose oratorios have great dramatic power. But the musical form in which Germany was to reach the greatest heights was instrumental music. This too had its rise in Italy, during the 17th and 18th centuries, in the form of the sonata, the concerto, the quartet, the symphony. Now Joseph Haydn (1732-1809) gave the symphony what was to be its final form. He was followed by a precocious and versatile genius, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (1756-1791), whose symphonies were excelled by his operas, both serious and comic (*Don Giovanni*, *Il Flauto magico*), which combined the melodic grace of the Italian school with the intimate expression of the German.

§ 102. THE REFORMIST MOVEMENT IN EUROPE. ITALY DURING THE PERIOD OF THE REFORMS.—In the course of the 18th century there was manifested a profound conflict between the politico-social order expounded by the philosophers, who had made a great impression on the opinions of the upper classes, and the order which actually obtained in the various European States. In these states there was no equality before the laws, but class and personal privilege; there were no guarantees of personal liberty, conscience, or worship. The taxes weighed upon the least prosperous, since the upper classes, the nobility and clergy, were exempt from taxation; nor did they, as at one time, perform any important social functions. To the burdens which the State imposed upon the citizens were added those which the seigneur inflicted on his subjects, since feudal law was still in force, though in varying measure, throughout Europe. This opposition between theory and practice, between the ideal and the reality, gave rise to ideas of reform.

As we have seen, the home of these ideas was France, and from France they were irradiated throughout Europe. The philosophers were agreed that the omnipotence of the State should be made to serve the infallibility of reason; they therefore addressed themselves to the princes from whom they might hope to obtain the realization of the desired reforms, although many were inclined to pin their faith upon constitutional institutions of the English type. And since the princes, being all desirous of reinforcing their absolute power, of establishing a strong and centralized government, desired the support



of public opinion, there was a certain affinity between the reformist philosophy and monarchical absolutism, so that in the second half of the 18th century we observe the rule of enlightened sovereigns, the government of philosophical ministers. There was at that time a certain tendency to believe that a decree was omnipotent, that a legislative measure might transform a society from one moment to the next. It was the Emperor Joseph II, a reformist sovereign *par excellence*, who declared: "I have made philosophy the law-giver of my empire; its logical applications will transform Austria."

The first obstacle to the consolidation of royal absolutism, and to the application of a number of reformist ideals (in particular the ideals of civil equality, religious tolerance and liberty of thought), was the Church, with its privileges and its principles of independence of the civil government, and intervention in the domain of that government. The State itself made war upon the Church, restricting its jurisdiction, limiting its privileges and its revenues, subjecting it to the control of the government, and making it dependent upon the laws of the State (jurisdictionalism). Thus, while the philosophers were attacking the doctrines of the Church the princes were attacking its institutions.

The Church was in no condition to oppose an effective resistance to the State, being weakened by internal conflicts. It had been seriously shaken by Jansenism, a religious movement which had its origin about the middle of the 17th century, in consequence of a theological dispute provoked by a book written by the Belgian bishop Jansenius. The Jansenists, citing St. Augustine, exalted the omnipotence of Divine grace at the expense of free will, and in opposition to the Jesuits they preached a moral rigourism. Condemned by the Roman Church and persecuted by the French State, they assumed the character of a political and religious opposition. Their ideas became diffused throughout Italy in the course of the 18th century, and aided the governments in their struggle against the Church.

The Papal autocracy was still more directly attacked in connection with the question of "Gallican liberty"; that is, the question of certain principles and institutions peculiar to the French Church, which had been solemnly affirmed in the "Four Articles" proclaimed by the assembly of the French clergy in 1682, and had been given the force

of law with the full approval of the monarchy. The Gallican ideas had made their way into Germany, where they made common cause with the old complaint of the German nation against the power of Papal Rome. The coadjutor Bishop of Treves, von Hontheim, published under the pseudonym of "Febronius" (whence the term "Febronianism") a famous work, *De statu ecclesiae* (1763), which not only proclaimed the superiority of the Council or the universal Church over the Pope, but denied that the pontiff had any jurisdiction over the bishops. The electoral princes of the Church appropriated this doctrine and drafted a plan for the reform of the Germanic Church in the direction of autonomy and independence of Rome (the "Punctation of Ems," 1786). The pontificate eventually obtained formal satisfaction as against this revolt, but the ideas and tendencies which inspired it were not really suppressed.

These movements naturally favoured the activities of the various states in the struggle against the Church. The most important episode of this struggle was the suppression of the Order of Jesuits, which constituted the outpost of the Papal Court.

The power acquired by the Jesuits had provoked a reaction against them, which succeeded all the more readily inasmuch as they had lost their primitive zeal and were immersed in secular affairs. The first blow was struck against them in Portugal by the prime minister of Joseph I, the Marquess of Pombal, who, accusing them of having provoked a revolt in Paraguay, and of instigating an attempt to assassinate the king, confiscated their property and drove them out of the kingdom (1759). France followed his example. The failure of a great commercial establishment which the Jesuits had founded in Martinique resulted in a series of lawsuits, which led the French *parlements* to examine the statutes and the work of the Company, when some of them decreed its dissolution (1762); in 1764 Louis XV published an edict which decreed that the Society no longer existed in France, and that its members could continue to live within the realm only as individuals. Charles III of Spain, in April 1767, suddenly had them arrested and transported to the coast of the Papal State; Ferdinand IV of Naples and Ferdinand of Bourbon, Duke of Parma, drove them out of their states. Pope Clement XIII protested, and entered

into a conflict with the Duke of Parma in particular, as a vassal of the Church. The other Bourbons, bound by a family pact, made common cause with the duke; the King of France occupied Avignon and the Comtat-Venaissin, and the King of Naples Benevento and Pontecorvo. On the death of Clement XIII his successor, Clement XIV, after laborious negotiations with the Bourbon courts, agreed to all their demands, abolishing the Company of Jesus by the Brief *Dominus ac Redemptor noster* (21 July 1773).

While it is true that the princes reinforced the absolute power by their work of reform, it must also be admitted that although they restricted civil liberty, and, still more, political liberty, they did endeavour to improve administration by rendering it uniform, justice by rendering it more expeditious and more humane, and economic and intellectual conditions by promoting industry and commerce, abolishing some of the charges and restrictions upon the liberty of labour, while promoting and diffusing culture.

In Italy the older states and dynasties, like the republics of Genoa and Venice, the House of Savoy, and the Estensi, showed themselves hostile or indifferent to the new ideas, and immune to innovations. The republic of Venice, now completely decadent, maintained its oligarchic constitution with distrustful vigilance, and this constitution was becoming more rigid and lifeless than ever. Attempts on the part of Angelo Querini (1761) and Giorgio Pisani and Carlo Contarini (1779-1780) to reform the constitution were unsuccessful, and the would-be reformers were relegated to fortresses. After the Peace of Passarowitz (§ 98) the ancient republic withdrew into absolute isolation; not only the army, but even the navy decayed; the expedition of the valiant Angelo Emo against the Bey of Tunis (1784-1786), undertaken with inadequate means, was finally interrupted at the desire of the government, leaving the relations between the republic and the Barbary chieftains exactly where they had been. The glorious city had now become a place of resort, where people thought only of amusing themselves, where the carnival lasted nearly half the year, where the use of masks was permitted, where games of chance were allowed and even promoted; a city of frequent and resplendent festivals, and steeped in corruption. Industry and commerce had so

greatly declined that the economic decadence became increasingly serious, although the duties were not onerous. The clergy were very numerous and extremely wealthy—there were about 45,000 ecclesiastics with an annual revenue of more than four million ducats—but the reforms which aimed at restricting their power were ineffective, being unduly cautious. Discontent was increasing in the provinces on the mainland, which were still without political rights in the capital, owing to the increasing burden of taxation, the administrative insufficiencies and abuses, and the confused multiplicity of the ordinances which maintained the feudal exactions, and the vexations caused by the rural *consorterie*.

Genoa was in no better condition. She too had retained her aristocratic constitution unchanged, and she was harassed by the continued disturbances in Corsica. A violent insurrection broke out in 1735; a German adventurer, Theodore von Neuhof, was proclaimed king by the islanders (1736), but was unable to hold his own in the island; and the revolt against Genoa continued. Genoa persuaded France to intervene (1737), and after some years the French troops succeeded in suppressing the revolt. During the War of the Austrian Succession Charles Emmanuel III sent an expedition to the island, with the intention of uniting it with Sardinia, but it failed in its purpose. The French were now once more friendly with Genoa. When they left the island (1750) a new rebellion broke out, headed by Pasquale Paoli, whom the rebels proclaimed their chieftain for life (1755), and who was supported by England. He organized and governed the island, but was unable to expel the Genoese from certain of their fortresses. Genoa once more appealed to the French, and finally, reserving a nominal sovereignty, ceded the possession of the island to France by the Treaty of Versailles, 15 May 1768. Paoli held out for another year, but was defeated and compelled to leave the island. He took refuge in England, and Corsica became a French province.

Victor Amedeus II of Savoy, on becoming King of Sicily by the Treaty of Utrecht, had immediately endeavoured to ameliorate the ills that afflicted the island; but when he was compelled to exchange Sicily for Sardinia, which was then in a most deplorable condition, he took little heed of the latter, but gave all his attention to his dominions

on the mainland. He reduced the privileges of the clergy and nobility, collected and published in a single code all the laws of the realm (1729), thereby uniting the various portions of the State under a single legislation, promoted agriculture and the industries, furthered education by giving the University of Turin a worthy seat, and founding the Provincial College (now the Collegio Carlo Alberto), embellished his capital, consolidating its position in the vanguard of the urbanities, fortified the frontier, building the fortress of Fenestrelle, and kept the army in readiness. In 1730 he abdicated in favour of his son Charles Emmanuel III, and with his new wife, the Marchesa di Spigno, he retired to Chambery. In the following year he went to Moncalieri, and attempted to return to power, apparently at the instigation of his wife. His son, at the urging of his advisers and the queen, had him arrested and taken to Rivoli, where he was placed under surveillance. He then obtained permission to return to Moncalieri, where he died (1732).

Charles Emmanuel III did much for Sardinia, seeking to improve its economic conditions, so that the population increased from 300,000 to 450,000. During his reign the universities of Cagliari (1764) and Sassari (1769) were founded. Modest reforms were introduced in the states on the mainland, principally administrative in character; and with the consent of Rome the power of the priests was slightly diminished. In order to ingratiate itself with the Holy See the Savoyard government arrested Giannone (§ 101) by a trick and kept him in prison until his death.

The successor to Charles Emmanuel III—Victor Amedeus III (1773–1796)—not only failed to introduce any new reforms: he did not even carry through those which had been initiated by his predecessors. He cared for nothing but the army, which he sought to train and arm in the Prussian manner. Neither he nor Charles Emmanuel had any real regard for education, any true appreciation of culture and intellectual ability; so that writers and scientists like Baretti (§ 101), the historian Denina, Lagrange (§ 100), the chemist Berthollet, and Bodoni, the celebrated printer, had to seek recognition elsewhere.

Matters were still worse in the Duchy of Modena and Reggio, for Duke Francesco III d'Este (1737–1780), appointed Governor of

Milan, took up his residence in that city and neglected his states: the only thing he did which deserves to be remembered was to publish a code of constitutional laws (1771). His successor, Ercole Rinaldo III (1780–1796), who married Maria Teresa Cybo, heiress to the imperial fief of Massa and Carrara, was a mild and benevolent ruler, but he was also avaricious and lethargic, as he proved in his relations with Rome. His only daughter and heiress Beatrice had married the Archduke Ferdinand of Habsburg-Lorraine (1771).

In the State of the Church Benedict XIV (Lambertini, 1740–1758), who in many respects was a truly beneficent pontiff, was succeeded by Clement XIII (Rezzonico, 1758–1769) and Clement XIV (Ganganelli, 1769–1774), during whose pontificates the conflict with the Jesuits continued. Clement XIII defended the Order; Clement XIV, yielding to pressure from the Bourbon courts, suppressed it. Since this conflict left the pontiffs little time or energy for other things, no reforms were carried out; the administration remained the worst in Europe, the State was sparsely populated, and a third of the population consisted of ecclesiastics. There was great poverty, no commerce, no industry, and agriculture was neglected. A few useful measures were introduced by Pius VI (Braschi, 1775–1779), but he also was distracted by the struggle to defend the position of the Church, which was menaced in all the Catholic states, and to oppose the reforms which the Emperor Joseph II had introduced in the ecclesiastical domain. He began the great task of draining the Pontine Marshes, and enlarged the Vatican Museums (Museo Pio Clementino). But these achievements, and his nepotism, made fresh demands on the already depleted finances of the State.

In the territories subject to Austria, the Lorraine princes, and the House of Bourbon, extensive and, on the whole, beneficent reforms were introduced. Lombardy, especially after the accession of Maria Theresa, shared in the work of reform accomplished in the Austrian monarchy. By the efforts of Count Beltrane Cristiani, followed by Count Firmian, the administration was reorganized, a census was taken, the taxes were equitably distributed, judicial procedure was improved, agriculture and industry were encouraged, and the economic development of the country was promoted; the Inquisition

was abolished, the ecclesiastical censorship and the right of asylum were suppressed; beneficent institutions were founded, schools, theatres, and libraries were opened; and the University of Pavia was an object of special solicitude. Joseph II, after the death of his mother, granted ample religious tolerance, suppressed numbers of convents, removed the restrictions to commerce, and abolished the trade corporations.

The Grand Duchy of Tuscany, which had declined under the last of the Medici, had two reformist princes: Francis of Lorraine, the husband of Maria Theresa, and his son Peter Leopold (1765-1790), who succeeded him in Tuscany. Peter Leopold, employing such excellent ministers as Pompeo Neri, Giulio Ruccellai, and Francesco Gianni, sought to abolish every trace of the Middle Ages in Tuscany. He reorganized the administration, instituting local benches of magistrates, and reformed the tributary system, making all citizens equal in respect of taxation; he rendered public account of the expenditure of the State, and without imposing new taxes he improved the conditions of the treasury, so that it was able to meet the enormous cost of reclaiming the Valdichiana and beginning the reclamation of the Maremma. Agriculture, which since the 16th century had been the economic mainstay of the country, made tremendous strides, thanks to the abolition of economic and juridical fetters (deeds of trust), the breaking up of the latifundia, the multiplication of small holdings, and the abolition of feudal servitude. Libertarian principles were applied to industry also, the corporations being suppressed; but this was not enough to make up for centuries of decay. Peter Leopold introduced the boldest reforms in the administration of justice; he was the first among European princes to abolish the death penalty, torture, and the confiscation of the criminal's property, while criminal procedure was expedited and made uniform for all classes of offenders. He promoted culture, reforming the universities of Pisa and Siena, and founding schools, academies and museums. In the religious domain he not only abolished the Inquisition, expelled the Jesuits, and closed monasteries: he also sought to reform the discipline and the liturgy of the Church in accordance with the Jansenistic ideas of Scipione de' Ricci, Bishop of Pistoia. A Synod convoked in Pistoia

in 1786 approved a series of ecclesiastical reforms and affirmations of principle relating to grace (in the Jansenistic sense: see above), the authority of the Oecumenical Council, declared to be superior to that of the pontiff, the power of the hierarchy, said to be derived from the faithful, and the Church's lack of coercive power, etc.; all of which was contrary to Roman Catholic doctrine. A conflict with the Pope followed, and there were riots in various parts of Tuscany, so that many of the reforms were revoked. In 1790 Peter Leopold, undoubtedly the greatest among the reforming princes of Italy, ascended the imperial throne as Leopold II, and was succeeded in Tuscany by his son Ferdinand III (1790-1801).

The two branches of the Bourbons reigning in Parma and Naples also boldly entered upon the path of reform. In the Duchy of Parma Don Philip of Bourbon (1748-1765), with the help of an able minister, a Frenchman, Guillaume Du Tillot, rendered his country prosperous and flourishing, did so much to promote culture that Parma deserved to be called the Athens of Italy, and restricted the power and the privileges of the clergy by a series of reforms that involved him in a serious conflict with the Church (see above). Du Tillot continued his work during the minority of Duke Ferdinand (1765-1802); but after the duke had married the daughter of Maria Theresa—Maria Amelia, who was hostile to all innovations—he was obliged to resign (1771). The young prince, at once incapable, bigoted and corrupt, allowed himself to be completely ruled by his wife, and abolished many of the reforms which had been introduced. In 1786 the Inquisition was re-established.

The Kingdom of Naples, which had been reduced to a melancholy condition by its Spanish rulers (the Austrian government had been of too brief duration to obtain useful results), began to recover under Don Carlos of Bourbon (1734-1759), who, with the aid of a capable minister, the Tuscan Bernardo Tanucci, proceeded to reorganize the administration, introduce uniformity of legislation, and abolish the many privileges of the nobility and clergy. The city of Naples was the object of his special solicitude; there he built the Teatro San Carlo and the palace of Capo di Monte; he initiated the work of excavation at Pompeii and Herculaneum, and began the construction



of the royal palace of Caserta. Here again the most radical and important reforms were in the ecclesiastical field, especially after Don Carlos had ascended the throne of Spain, when during the minority of his younger son Ferdinand IV (1659–1825) the government was entrusted to a council of regency, of which the most influential member was Tanucci. Tithes were abolished and many convents suppressed, the annual present of a white horse to the Pope (an act of feudal homage) was discontinued, the Jesuits were expelled, and in the struggle between the four Bourbon houses and the Church Benevento and Pontecorvo were occupied. But when the king attained his majority, and he proved to be completely dominated by his wife, Maria Caroline, another daughter of Maria Theresa's, a handsome, resolute, ambitious woman, who wished to replace the influence of Spain by that of Austria, Tanucci was forced to resign (1776). The reins of government were seized by the queen, who raised one of her favourites to power: Admiral Acton, who was of Irish origin, and who devoted all his energies to the army and the navy, without producing any notable results. The civil and ecclesiastical reforms were abandoned, though the new ideas were becoming more and more widely diffused in Naples by a number of distinguished writers, including Antonio Genovesi and Gaetano Filangeri, whom we have already mentioned (§ 101) and Mario Pagano, a philosopher and jurist. In Sicily a few useful reforms were introduced by the viceroy, Domenico Caracciolo, but his endeavours, which were opposed by the nobility of the island, and were not seconded by the central government, were not crowned by any important results.

## CHAPTER XVII

### *FROM THE REVOLUTION TO THE RESTORATION*

§ 103. REACTIONARIES AND JACOBINS. THE FRENCH IN ITALY AND THE ITALIAN REPUBLICS.—About 1790 the reformist and progressive activities of the Italian governments (that is, of those which were progressive) were suddenly checked, and a reaction set in. This was due either to the fact that the sovereigns and ministers were replaced by others, or to resistance offered (as we have seen that it was offered in Tuscany) by the population. The beginnings of the French Revolution, which terrified the rulers, resulted in the hardening of this reaction.

The ideals of progress and reform, however, continued to find disciples in Italy, and a small minority of thinkers were affected by the influence of the French Revolution, while the privileged classes and the populace were at one in their abhorrence of the Revolution, which they regarded as impious and subversive. Here and there in Italy nuclei of Jacobins were formed. In Tuscany one Filippo Buonarroti attempted to foment a rising; he was arrested and expelled, and continued his revolutionary activities in France. In Naples, after the arrival of the French fleet in December 1792, a patriotic society was constituted, and there was a Jacobin conspiracy. This was followed by a great political trial, which ended in three executions. One of these was of the Apulian Emanuele de Deo, who was hanged on 17 October 1794. In the same year certain patriotic clubs were discovered in Turin, and Francesco Junod and Giovanni Chantel were hanged. At Bulla, Francesco de Stefanis was concerned in a republican conspiracy; he was hanged on the 24 May 1794. In November 1794 there was the Zamboni conspiracy in Bologna; but this was apparently more of a municipal character. Its ringleader, Luigi Zamboni, committed suicide; one G. B. de Rolandis, a Piedmontese,

was hanged in Bologna on the 23 April 1796. In March 1795 a conspiracy was discovered in Palermo; the head of this conspiracy was said to be the Catanian jurist, Francesco Paolo di Blasi. He was beheaded, being a noble, on the 20 May 1795; three others, plebeians, were hanged.

Entirely at one in their unconditional attachment to the old order, and their utter hatred of the new France, the Italian rulers were less completely in agreement in the matter of pursuing an active policy against the latter. In 1791 Victor Amedeus III (two of whose daughters had married the brothers of Louis XVI, both of whom were already *émigrés*; the Comte de Provence and the Comte d'Artois—that is, the future Louis XVIII and Charles X) proposed in vain to the other Italian governments a permanent confederation with a common diet; and the Tuscan project of a league of neutrals met with no greater success. In April 1792 the French government, then still monarchical, was anxious to conclude an alliance against Austria on the basis of an exchange of Savoy for the Milanese; but Victor Amedeus III refused this opportunity of a Savoyard Italian policy *a priori*, owing to his hatred and dread of the Revolution; on the contrary, in September he concluded an alliance with Austria. Suddenly the French armies occupied Savoy and Nice, without serious opposition on the part of the Savoyard army. In October the occupying forces convoked a national assembly “of the Allobrogi,” which decreed union with France, and this was sanctioned by the French Convention on the 27 November. The annexation of Nice followed on the 31 January 1793. Both annexations corresponded with the doctrine of the “natural frontiers” of France (Rhine, Alps, Pyrenees) adopted by the Convention. Immediately, however, there were the beginnings of discontent with and opposition to the new government, owing to its revolutionary policy. Sardinia also was attacked by the French fleet, but without success.

Victor Amedeus III concluded an alliance (April 1743) with England also, and notwithstanding the little assistance received from Austria, he attempted during the year to reconquer the lost territories, but without success. The war was continued, with varying results, in the Western Alps, which the French succeeded in crossing

at several points, and in Western Liguria. King Victor obtained larger reinforcements from Austria after the conclusion of the Austro-Sardinian Treaty of Valenciennes (29 May 1794), which contemplated the return to Austria of Novara, with its territory, in exchange for acquisitions in France: a treaty which was in absolute opposition to the idea of a national Savoyard policy.

Of the other Italian states, Genoa and Venice remained neutral and maintained normal relations with France. The Grand Duke of Tuscany, Ferdinand III, would willingly have followed their example, but in October 1794 the menace of the British fleet compelled him to declare for the coalition; however, he took no active part in the conflict, and on the 9th February 1795, before any other members of the coalition, he concluded peace with the French Republic. Diplomatic relations between the Papal government and France had been broken off before the declaration of the Republic, on account of the ecclesiastical laws of the Constituent Assembly (incameration of ecclesiastical property and civil constitution of the clergy); on the declaration of the Republic the quarrel was still further embittered by the murder, by the Roman populace, of the French diplomatist Bassville (January 1793), but still Pius VI did not join the coalition. The sovereigns of Naples, Ferdinand and Caroline, who were extremely hostile to the Revolution (Caroline was the sister of Marie Antoinette), and were bound to the Habsburgs by the marriages of their children, at first delayed declaring themselves, being afraid of the French squadron which appeared off Naples at the end of 1792; but in July 1793 an alliance was concluded with England, and Naples joined the English in taking action against France.

In Corsica there was desperate fighting for and against France. The formal annexation of Corsica to France was effected by the revolutionary government, Genoa protesting in vain. Pasquale Paoli had returned to the island, reconciled with constitutional France, but he very soon came into conflict with the Jacobins, when two factions were formed, and two governments. The Jacobin, anti-Paolist faction was joined by the young French officer Napoleon Bonaparte, a Corsican by birth (*b.* Ajaccio 15 August 1769), who also took part in the unsuccessful attempts upon Sardinia. In Corsica

Paoli had the upper hand for the time being. He appealed to the English (February 1794), and a Corsican assembly proclaimed George III King of Corsica. In October 1795, however, Paoli left the island, returning to England (where he died in 1807); in October 1796 Corsica was reconquered by a French army. The young Corsican officer, Napoleon Bonaparte, as a result of the varying vicissitudes of the military career and political fortune, had risen to the command of the Army of Italy. This command he assumed in March 1796, a few days after his marriage to Josephine Tascher de la Pagerie, the widow of General Beauharnais; and it was she who obtained it for him. In accordance with the new plan of the French Directory, while Bonaparte was operating in Italy two other armies, commanded by Moreau and Jourdan, were to attack the Austrians on the Rhine and the Danube. The common objective of the three armies was to be Vienna. Bonaparte, having crossed the Ligurian Alps, defeated the Austrians, commanded by Beaulieu, at Montenotte, Dego and Millesimo (12, 13 and 14 April 1796), and while they were separated from the Piedmontese under General Colli he turned against the latter. Colli victoriously sustained the enemy's assaults at Ceva, San Michele and San Giacomo (16, 19 April), but in the face of superior forces he had to fall back on Mondové, where he was defeated (20–21 April). Victor Amedeus III then decided to sign the armistice of Cherasco (28 April), which was followed by the Peace of Paris (15 May), by which he ceded Nice and Savoy and pledged himself to give free passage to the French troops. In the meantime Bonaparte, having crossed the Po at Piacenza, and threatening Beaulieu's communications, forced him to fall back upon the Adda, defeated him again at the bridge of Lodi (10 May), and entered Milan, while Beaulieu shut himself up in Mantua. Bonaparte now laid siege to Mantua, violating Venetian neutrality by occupying Peschiera and Venice; but similar violations were committed by the Austrian troops. The spoliations and requisitions to which the occupied provinces were subjected by the French provoked various movements of revolt on the part of the people, and in Pavia the revolt was severely repressed (25 May). The Duchies of Modena and Parma had to pay a heavy price for peace; Massa and Carrara, Leghorn, and part of the

Romagna were occupied; the Pope had to cede the occupied territories to the French and pay a "contribution" in money and works of art; the King of Naples appealed for an armistice, which he obtained, and peace followed in October. Meanwhile the Austrians resumed the offensive in Italy, and an army of 70,000 men under the command of Wurmser moved southwards to liberate Mantua. But Bonaparte attacked it while it was on the march, and defeated it at Lonato and Castiglione (30 July—5 August). He then defeated a lieutenant of Wurmser's, Davidovic, at Rovereto, and occupied Trento (5 September); and at Primolano and Bassano (7 and 8 September) he again defeated Wurmser, who, however, succeeded in shutting himself up in Mantua. But simultaneously with these victorious actions a political ferment had come to a head in the territories occupied by the French or verging upon them. A new patriotic or "Jacobin" party was being formed in the upper classes of Italian society. Milan, under the provincial administration instituted by Bonaparte, became the centre of the movement. Patriots hurried thither from all parts of Italy, and among them were such intellectuals as the poets Monti and Foscolo and the future historian Botta. Periodicals were founded to diffuse the new ideals of liberty and equality, and to discuss the problems relating to the constitution of a new Italy. The Lombard administration, in September 1796, announced a competition on the subject: "What form of free government is best fitted to promote the happiness of Italy?" Among the fifty-two writers who answered the appeal, the winner of the competition was Melchiorre Gioia of Piacenza, who recommended the formation of a unitary, liberal and democratic republic. The ideal of unity found expression in popular songs that were sung in the streets of Milan. In August Reggio Emilia rebelled successfully against the duke; Bonaparte supported the movement, and on the 6 October he occupied Modena. An assembly which he convoked in Modena on the 16 October, and which included representatives of Modena, Reggio, Bologna and Ferrara, decided upon the creation of a "Cispadane Republic." A "Lombard Legion" and a "Cispadane Legion" were formed: bodies of volunteers wearing the white-red-green tricolour flag, which now made its first appearance. It was adopted as the national flag of the new republic, which

was definitively constituted in the assembly which met in Reggio on the 27 December 1796.

Austria, however, had not yet thrown in her hand. In November a new army, commanded by Allvinczy, entered Italy and threw the French back on Verona. But Bonaparte, after three days of hard fighting (15, 16, 17 November) at Arcole, compelled Allvinczy to retire upon Vicenza. The Austrian general made a last effort in the following winter, but was completely defeated at Rivoli (14-16 January 1797). On the 2 February Mantua surrendered.

After the Pope, who had broken the armistice, was compelled by a rapid and victorious march to sign the Treaty of Tolentino (19 February), by which he surrendered Avignon, Comtat-Venaissin, and the legations of Ferrara, Bologna and Romagna, Bonaparte decided to march upon Vienna. He therefore turned against the Archduke Charles, who had come to assume command of the army in Italy, forced the lines of the Piave, the Tagliamento and the Isonzo, and descended the valley of the Drave, reaching a point beyond Klagenfurt. But his position was precarious, and he felt it advisable to negotiate for peace. He therefore concluded the preliminaries of Loeben (18 April), which the Directory unwillingly ratified. By these Austria was allotted the territory of the Venetian Republic as far as the Adda in exchange for Belgium and Lombardy. By this exchange Austria would extend and strengthen her position in Italy. A bloody insurrection against the French, provoked by their overbearing behaviour and the incitements of the clergy, broke out in Verona on Easter Monday, and was not suppressed for several days (the "Veronese Easter," 17-23 April). It served as a pretext for sacrificing the Venetian State and overthrowing the ancient government of the Signoria. In response to Bonaparte's menaces the last Doge, Ludovico Manin, abdicated, and with him the Signoria, and the Grand Council voted the transformation of the State into a democratic republic (12 May), despite the tumult of the Venetian populace, who expressed their opposition to the new republic by shouting: "Viva San Marco!"

Thus, the personal policy of Bonaparte, which was contrary to that of the Directory—in accordance with which Italy would have served merely as a pawn, a means of bargaining for the left bank

of the Rhine and a general peace—led to a further extension of the power of France, and also of the political transformations of Italy. In Piedmont, Charles Emmanuel IV (who succeeded to his father in October 1796) concluded (5 April 1797) a treaty of alliance with France. This did not save the country from revolutionary movements (June-July), which were, however, repressed with extreme severity (there were more than sixty executions), without opposition from the French. At the same time the Piedmontese government introduced a few reforms in harmony with the new ideals. The old aristocratic republic of Genoa, on the other hand, was compelled in June 1747 to transform itself into the democratic "Ligurian Republic." The ex-Duchy of Milan, the former Venetian territory as far as the Adda, and the Cispadane Republic were in July 1797 combined to form the "One and Indivisible Cisalpine Republic," with a Directory and a two-chamber legislative body (the Grand Council, which proposed legislative measures, and the Council of Ancients, which approved or rejected them). The constitution of the 9 July was imposed by Bonaparte, who selected the members of the Directory and the Legislature instead of allowing them to be elected by the citizens. In October, following upon revolutionary disturbances in Valtellina, the latter was taken from Grisons and united to the Cisalpine Republic.

On the night of 18 October 1797, at Passeriano, near Udine, Bonaparte concluded the treaty of peace with Austria known as the Treaty of Campoformio. By this the Cisalpine-Austrian frontier ran from the Adda to the Adige, but Venice also went to Austria. The patriots of the Venetian mainland agitated in vain for union with the Cisalpine Republic, and the patriots of Venice as vainly demanded independence. Venice was abandoned by the French after extensive depredations (amongst other things, the bronze quadriga was removed from the façade of San Marco), and the Austrians entered the city on the 18 January 1798. In November 1797 Bonaparte returned to France (leaving it the following year for Egypt); Berthier took his place. In the Cisalpine Republic, after his departure, there was a conflict between the constitutional organs and the French military command. Thanks to the material strength of the latter, the Legislature was compelled to accept a treaty of alliance (4 March



1798), which it regarded as oppressive, while the depredations of the occupying forces continued. However, a number of useful reforms were introduced; but then and later the unfamiliar institution of compulsory military service was regarded by the people as a particular grievance. In June 1798 the Directory sent civil commissaries instead of military to maintain political relations with the Cisalpine Republic, and upon their insistence the constitution was modified in a restrictive sense and measures were taken against the more headstrong "patriots."

Even before this the French Republic, in pursuance of its policy of expansion, had taken an important step in Rome. In consequence of a conflict between the populace and the French, in the course of which a French general was killed, the city was occupied by Berthier, and the "Roman republic" was proclaimed (15 February), with senators, tribunes and consuls; Pope Pius VI was deported, first to Tuscany and then to France. In Rome the requisitions and depredations were more grievous than ever, while the adherents of the new order of things were far less numerous than in Lombardy.

In Piedmont, after an invasion of republican bands from various quarters, who were repulsed by the royal troops, and even more serious interference on the part of France (the French, in July 1798, having demanded and obtained the surrender of the citadel of Turin), Charles Emmanuel IV abdicated, in December 1798, recommending his subjects to obey the new government, and in February 1799 he retired to Sardinia, under the protection of the British fleet. A provisional government was constituted, which introduced laws relating to liberty and equality, and here again the work of reform was accompanied by the oppression and spoliation of the inhabitants. A petition was forwarded praying for annexation to France.

Lucca also was entered by the French in January 1799, and in February the old oligarchy was replaced by a democratic republic. This was followed in March by the occupation of Tuscany, when the Grand Duke, after urging his subjects to offer no resistance, repaired to Vienna.

The fall of the Bourbon kingdom was contemporaneous with that of the Savoyard; though before it fell it had attempted to resist the French in arms. During Bonaparte's expedition to Egypt the

French fleet was destroyed at Aboukir (August 1798) by Nelson. At the Bourbon Court all were delirious with enthusiasm; and when Turkey, England and Russia formed an alliance against France, Naples joined it, together with Austria, and opened hostilities by despatching an army against Rome. It occupied the city, but was defeated and scattered at Civitacastellana (5 December 1798) by the French General Championnet, who then marched upon Naples. The king and queen fled to Sicily. In the city the Neapolitan populace, the *lazzaroni*, crying "Long live the holy Faith, long live San Gennaro, death to the Jacobins!" fought desperately against the French and the Neapolitan "Jacobins" who had taken possession of Castel Sant' Elmo. After a three days' struggle (21-23 January 1799) the *lazzaroni*, having received special assurances in respect of religion, surrendered, and Championnet having entered the city the "Parthenopean Republic" was proclaimed. At its head was an elect company of intellectuals; the jurist and political writer Mario Pagano elaborated the constitution, which was of the Graeco-Roman type, with archons, censors and ephors; and with great enthusiasm, though the people gave but grudging approval, they set to work upon the new order of things. Among the creators of this order were certain eminent clerics who had formerly been royalists and anti-Roman, and who now preached the perfect harmony existing between democracy and the New Testament.

The duration and consolidation of the new regime depended before all on the outcome of the war between republican France and the renewed coalition of the old rulers. The French Army of Italy (part of which consisted of an "Italic Legion" raised from the Cisalpine Republic) was defeated by the Austro-Russian forces, first on the Adige (March-April), then at Cassano on the Adda (27 April), on the Trebbia (17-19 June), and at Nevi (15 August); so that Genoa was all that was left to the French in Italy. A violent anti-French reaction had broken out in Southern Italy, Tuscany, and Piedmont, and armed bands of the fanatical populace were hastening to the defence of the "Holy Faith." Cardinal Ruffo, crossing over from Sicily and recruiting irregulars, among whom were numerous brigands—one of them, Michele Pezza, had achieved a bad eminence

as Fra Diavolo—subdued Calabria and Basilicata and marched upon Naples—already evacuated by the French—compelling the city to surrender and promising to spare the lives of the leaders and creators of the republican government (June 1799). But on the arrival of Admiral Nelson the terms of surrender were violated; thousands upon thousands of citizens were arrested, and hundreds were sentenced to death; among whom were Mario Pagano, Domenico Cirillo, a physician and university professor, Francesco Conforti, juriconsult, Vincenzo Russo, the valiant Colonel Gabriele Manthonè, Admiral Francesco Caracciolo, whom Nelson hanged from the yard-arm of his flagship, and Eleonara Fonseca Pimentel, a woman of great intellectual ability who had supported the republican cause as a journalist. In Tuscany and Piedmont, however, the confederate bands distinguished themselves by their excesses, while Lombardy was conquered and cruelly misgoverned by the Austro-Russians.

In Germany too the French were defeated; but they were victorious in Switzerland and Holland. Fortunately for them, Tsar Paul I withdrew from the coalition. During the consequent interruption of military operations the *coup d'état* of 18–19 Brumaire (9 and 10 November 1799) took place in Paris, leading to the constitution of the Consulate, with Napoleon Bonaparte as First Consul. The Consulate was pacific and conservative in its tendencies, and it sought to obtain the support of the ex-royalists and the clergy.

§ 104. NAPOLEONIC ITALY.—After a first period which was devoted to the systematization of the internal affairs of France, Napoleon, who with the greatest secrecy had been organizing a reserve army, descended upon Italy through the pass of the Great St. Bernard (May 1800), and once more entered Milan (2 June). Melas, having obtained the capitulation of Genoa (5 June), had to cope with the unexpected enemy. After a first encounter at Montebello, when the French had the advantage, the two armies met on the plain of Marengo, not far from Alessandria (14 June). The Austrians must already have regarded themselves as the victors, when on the arrival of General Desaix, whom Napoleon had despatched in the direction of Novi, but who had turned back on hearing the thunder of the guns, the

French renewed the attack, with the result that Melas was completely defeated. The victory, which cost Desaix his life, assured the victors of the possession of Piedmont, Liguria and Lombardy, since Melas, by the terms of the armistice of Alessandria, pledged himself to withdraw his troops to the left bank of the Mincio and the Po.

On Napoleon's return to France operations were resumed; Brune, to whom he had handed over the command, forced the passage of the Mincio and occupied Verona, drove Marshal Bellegarde across the Bacchiglione and the Brenta, and compelled him to sign the armistice of Treviso (16 January 1801). The Neapolitans also were defeated in Central Italy and compelled to accept an armistice. In Germany the Archduke Johann attacked Moreau at Hohenlinden, but was completely defeated (3 December 1800). Austria sued for peace, which was concluded at Luneville (9 February 1801). Francis II, speaking not only as an Austrian sovereign, but also as head of the Holy Roman Empire, recognized the Rhine as the frontier between France and Germany, ceded the Milanese to the Cisalpine Republic, and agreed that Tuscany should go to the Bourbons of Parma. By the Treaty of Madrid, concluded between France and Spain (21 March), the Grand Duchy of Tuscany and the State of the Presidi, excepting the Isle of Elba and the principality of Piombino, which were annexed to France, were constituted a kingdom; and the Infante of Parma, who had married a Spanish princess, took the name of Ludovico I, King of Etruria. The pontiff retained his states, apart from the legations; and with the King of Naples France concluded the Treaty of Florence (26 March), by which the king detached himself from the coalition and allied himself with France, while French garrisons were stationed in Otranto, Taranto and Brindisi. With England Bonaparte was able to conclude the Peace of Amiens (2 March 1802). One of the conditions of this peace was the return of Malta to the Knights of Jerusalem, the island having been occupied by Bonaparte while he was on his way to Egypt, and afterwards captured by the English. But the restitution was never made, for hostilities suddenly broke out again between France and England.

Bonaparte, a victorious peacemaker, whose prestige attained its apogee on the morrow of the Peace of Amiens, had taken steps to

organize the Cisalpine Republic, to which the Novarese was added in September 1800. Convoked at Lyons in December 1801, an assembly of 450 notables of the republic (*Consulta di Lione*) approved the constitution of the 26 January 1802, which had been prepared at Napoleon's instance. A president, the head of the government, appointed a vice-president and the ministers, proposed legislation, and concluded treaties; a Council of State (*Consulta*) of eight members dealt with foreign affairs and decreed exceptional measures for the security of the State; a body of twenty censors exercised certain functions of control; a legislative body of sixty-five members voted the laws; three electoral colleges—of landowners, of scholars and clerics, and of merchants and traders (two hundred in each) assembled in various cities at least once in every two years to elect the members of the above bodies. The constitution was organized in such a way as to reduce the participation of the people in the government to a minimum. Against its own inclinations, the *consulta* was compelled to elect Napoleon himself as president, who in return selected as vice-president the Milanese Francesco Malzi. The republic now assumed the name of the "Italian Republic," which was greeted with great acclamation by the assembly.

The first article of the constitution of the 26 January declared: "The Apostolic Catholic Roman religion is the religion of the State." When he returned to Milan in June 1800 Bonaparte had proclaimed his intention of protecting "our religion" and of relying on the support of the clergy, calling the Milanese parish priests "my dearest friends." Afterwards he concluded with Pius VII the Concordat (relating to France) of the 15 July 1801, which declared that the Catholic religion was the religion of the great majority of the French people, guaranteed public worship, provided for the stipends of the clergy, and attributed to the head of the State the appointment of the bishops, who were canonically instituted by the pontiff. A similar Concordat was concluded by the Italian Republic on the 16th September 1803; and just as Napoleon had unilaterally followed the French Concordat by the "organic articles" which restricted the powers of the Church and increased those of the State, so Melzi did the same with the "organic decree" of the 26 January 1804.

The institution of the Empire in France was followed, as by analogy, by the transformation of the Italian Republic into the Kingdom of Italy, and on the 17 March 1805 Napoleon was proclaimed King of Italy in Paris by a decree of the Consulta, by the terms of which the crown would be transmitted from Napoleon to a natural or adopted son, and not thereafter united with the crown of France. Napoleon proceeded to Milan, and on the 26 May he crowned himself in the Duomo with the iron crown, saying: "God has given it me and woe to him who touches it." He then provided, by another decree of the Consulta (such decrees were called Constitutional Statutes), for the reorganization of the kingdom, instituting a viceroy, a number of high officials, and a Council of State on the French model. The viceroy was not Melzi or another Italian, but Napoleon's stepson, Eugene Beauharnais, who had nothing to do but carry out Napoleon's orders, and who was told by the Emperor that he must regard the interests of the kingdom as absolutely subordinate to those of France (that is, to Napoleon's personal policy). The Legislative Corps, to which he sent the drafts of laws from Paris, once permitted itself to propose certain modifications; when notwithstanding its prompt submission it was compelled to interrupt its sessions and was not again convoked. The liberty of the Press, existing *de jure*, was suppressed *de facto*, nor was the secrecy of the post respected. The financial administration, under the Novarese minister Prina, enjoyed an exemplary organization, but the taxpayers regarded it as oppressive and vexatious, the more so as part of the revenues found its way to France. Another large portion, however, was earmarked for the Italian Army (based on compulsory conscription, which was extremely unpopular), whose constitution and whose military prowess in the Napoleonic wars were facts of great national importance. Another part of the revenues went to the many and magnificent public works, both economic and military in character (the Simplon and Mont Cénis highways, canals in the Lombard plain, rectification of rivers in Venetia, etc.). These helped to stimulate the trade of the country, which also profited by the uniformity of weights and measures. Even more important was the uniformity and modernity of legislation which resulted from the introduction of the French codes: the civil

code, known as the Code Napoléon, the penal code, and the commercial code.

Not long after its proclamation the kingdom of Italy was considerably enlarged as a result of Napoleon's war against the new coalition of England, Austria and Russia. The Italian Army took part in this war, under Beauharnais and Masséna, defeating the Archduke Charles at Caldiero (30 October 1805). After the decisive Napoleonic victory of Austerlitz (2 December) Austria was compelled to conclude the Peace of Pressburg (26 December), by which Venetia was united to the kingdom of Italy, while Istria and Dalmatia were annexed to the French Empire; the Trentino was allotted to Bavaria. In the following year (6 August 1800) Francis II laid down the crown of the Holy Roman Empire, which ceased to exist, and became Francis I, Emperor of Austria, a title which he assumed in August 1804.

Since in the war of 1805 the King of Naples had been guilty of a violation of neutrality, Napoleon despatched an army to dethrone him, and the king took refuge in Sicily, under the protection of the British fleet (February 1806). Napoleon gave the crown to his elder brother Joseph, and later, when Joseph became King of Spain, to his brother-in-law Joachim Murat (June 1808). Bands of Bourbon soldiers, who had something of the brigand about them, infested Calabria, Apulia and the Abruzzi, and were defeated only with great difficulty and by measures of extraordinary severity. The reorganization of the Kingdom of Naples in accordance with the modern principles of uniformity and equality was undertaken with great energy; the feudal laws were abolished, the Napoleonic codes introduced, the area under cultivation was increased, and public works were put in hand.

Apart from the two vassal kingdoms of Italy and Naples the rest of the peninsula was gradually incamerated directly in the Empire. At the end of September 1802 Piedmont had been annexed to France. The duchy of Parma, on the death of Duke Ferdinand in October 1802, was occupied by the French; it was anticipated that as a matter of "geopolitical logic" it would be united with the kingdom of Italy, but actually, in 1808, it was annexed by the Empire. In June 1805 Genoa was united with the Empire, by the expedient of one of

the usual deputations. In 1805 Lucca became a principality dependent on the Empire under Napoleon's sister Elisa Baciocchi. In December 1807 the widowed queen-mother of Etruria, Marie Louise, regent for her son Charles Louis, was sent packing, and Tuscany (although a deputation voted for an autonomous principality) was united with the Empire, after Napoleon had announced that he intended to unite it with the kingdom of Italy. Following upon a dispute between Napoleon and Pius VII, who refused his adherence to Napoleon's war policy, the Papal State and Rome itself were occupied (1807-1808); in 1807 the Marches were united with the kingdom of Italy, and in May 1809 the temporal power of the pontiff was abolished by decree, when Rome, Latium, and Umbria were united with the Empire. In July Pius VII, who had pronounced a more than nominal excommunication upon the occupying forces, was deported first to Savona and then to Fontainebleau.

After the Treaty of Vienna of October 1809, which concluded yet another victorious war against Austria—a war in which the Italian armies again played a great part—the kingdom of Italy received a final increment by the annexation of the Trentino as far as Bolzano (Botzen). Its configuration was extremely arbitrary, and its frontiers were everywhere open to France. The despotism of Napoleon in the administration of the kingdom became more and more vexatious; in the economic domain it made itself felt through the Continental Blockade, initiated in 1807, and afterwards progressively intensified, in order to close the Continent to British trade. At the beginning of the century the cultural life of Italy had a moment of splendour; it was the period of the two great poets, Vincenzo Monti (1754-1828) and Ugo Foscolo (1778-1827). In them the classicism which had been revived by Parini reached its culmination, but not without a scholarly assimilation of other elements, deriving from foreign literature, especially the English and the German. Monti, apart from the encomiastic lyric, excelled in short poems inspired by contemporary happenings, above all in the *Basvilliana* (the protagonist being the spirit of Ugo Bassville, § 103) and *Mascheroniana*; he also gave Italy a translation of the *Iliad* which has all the merit of an original work. Foscolo's masterpiece is the poem entitled *I Sepolcri*,



in which civic idealism, patriotic ardour, and a remarkable power of historical evocation have found expression in magnificent blank verse, than which Italian literature has little finer. In both these writers we are struck by the part which the new literature played in the political and moral life of the time; and this was shown also in three lectures on literature in the University of Pavia. Historico-political literature flourished in Milan in the days of the Cisalpine Republic; a political refugee from Southern Italy, Vincenzo Cuoco, published in 1801 a *Saggio storico sulla rivoluzione di Napoli*, which contained a shrewd valuation of the Parthenopæan Republic; Melchiorre Gioia followed the work of which we have spoken (§ 103) by other political pamphlets. But these publicists fell silent as the Napoleonic despotism grew more oppressive, and in the last years of the kingdom its intellectual life was overcome with sterility.

§ 105. THE FALL OF THE NAPOLEONIC REGIME. THE CONGRESS OF VIENNA AND THE HOLY ALLIANCE.—The disastrous Russian campaign meant the moral death of the Napoleonic regime in Italy. To that monstrous and useless sacrifice of human lives Italy had largely contributed through the armies of the two Italian kingdoms; the troops of the Italic kingdom having especially distinguished themselves in the rearguard action of Malo-Jaroslavetz (24 October 1812). Of twenty-seven thousand men of this army only one thousand returned. These victims were added to the many who had already fallen in Spain and other distant battle-fields, and were lamented all the more in that their death had served no national interest. The great European coalition which was formed in 1813, and which was victorious at Leipzig in October, was able to profit by this frame of mind. The viceroy Eugène, after attempting to defend the line of the Drave and Save, appealed in vain to Murat for assistance, and was compelled to fall back upon the Isonzo, and then upon the Adige, when, rejecting the invitation of his father-in-law, the King of Bavaria, to desert the cause of Napoleon, he prepared to resist, calling upon the Italians, in a proclamation (October 1813), to fight for their independence. Murat, on the other hand, who had vainly begged his brother-in-law to increase his territory (by including all

Italy south of the Po), had concluded an alliance with Austria. He occupied central Italy, but in respect of Eugène he maintained an irresolute attitude, endeavouring to avoid hostilities. In February 1814 the Austrian generals Bellegarde and Nugent began a decisive action against the viceroy, one on the Adige, the other on the lower course of the Po. Seconding this action by political expedients, they declared in their proclamations that they had come to liberate the peninsula from the foreign yoke and enable it to decide its own destinies. Lord William Bentinck also, disembarking at Leghorn in order to co-operate with the Austrians, exhorted the Italians to unite with the British and recover their national independence. Beauharnais, pressed by the Austrians, had to retire upon the Mincio. At Roverbella (8 February) he defeated them; but at the beginning of March Murat, advancing into Emilia, decided to attack him, even though he was at the time in secret treaty with him. The negotiations were broken off on the 1 April, and hostilities were resumed, the Neapolitans crossing the Taro, while the Austrians again approached the Mincio.

When the news of Napoleon's abdication reached Italy the viceroy Eugène concluded an armistice with all his enemies (16 April) at Schiarino-Rizzino, near Mantua. He now decided to make an attempt to obtain the kingdom of Italy for himself, but the party which favoured this move, though sufficiently strong in the army, was definitely a minority in Milan as against the Francophobes, some of whom wanted an independent kingdom, while others preferred Austrian rule. On the 20 April there was general rioting in Milan against the candidature of Eugène, and the mob, seizing the hated minister Prina, tortured him to death. When the viceroy heard this, being then in Mantua, he entered into a new convention (23 April) with the Austrians, surrendering the whole kingdom into their hands, and on the 27 April he left for Munich. Between the 26 and 28 April Milan was occupied by the Austrians. Victor Emmanuel I returned to Piedmont, having succeeded to his brother Charles Emmanuel IV on the abdication of the latter, and on the 20 May he made his solemn entry into Turin. In May Pius VII returned to Rome, Napoleon having restored him to liberty in March.

Of the Napoleonic rulers Murat remained; but Ferdinand IV had

not given up hope of recovering Naples. In 1812 he had been obliged by Lord William Bentinck to grant a new constitution to Sicily. Murat's fate was discussed at the Congress of Vienna, which met in November 1814 to determine the reorganization of Europe; when England, and still more France, intrigued against him and in favour of a Bourbon restoration. Having been warned of these manoeuvres, Murat, when Napoleon returned from Elba, adhered to his cause and made war upon Austria. Entering Romagna from the Marches, on the 30 March 1815 he published in Rimini a celebrated proclamation in which he invited the Italians to gather round him, firmly united, in the fight for Italian independence. After defeating the Austrians on the Panaro (4 April) he had to retire before the superior forces of the enemy. He was defeated at Tolentino (3 May) and thrown back within the frontiers of the kingdom. From Pescara he promulgated a liberal constitution, but in vain; on the 20 May his generals, together with the representatives of Great Britain and Austria, drew up the convention of Casa Lanza (Capua) by which the Bourbon rule was restored to Naples. Murat left the kingdom, and Ferdinand IV re-entered Naples on the 3 June. In Corsica, where he had taken refuge, Murat heard that the return of the Bourbons was exciting discontent. He conceived the daring plan of a landing in the kingdom, and with a few companions he disembarked at Pizzo in Calabria (8 October 1815). No one rose in his support; and, being captured by the governmental forces, he was sentenced to death by a military commission and shot (13 October).

The final protocol of the Congress of Vienna, which united all the individual treaties, was signed on the 9 June 1815 (nine days before the final defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo, followed by his abdication and deportation to St. Helena). By this treaty Lombardy and Venetia constituted the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom under Austrian rule. The kingdom of Sardinia, after the failure of Victor Emmanuel's diplomatic attempts to acquire Lombardy, was increased by the addition of Liguria, while it lost to France certain portions of Savoy (Chablais and Faucigny), which were neutralized; the Duchy of Modena, with Massa and Carrara, was restored to the House of Este-Lorraine (Francesco IV); the Duchy of Parma, conferred for

the term of her life upon Marie Louise, the wife of Napoleon, was to revert upon her death to the Bourbons (to Charles Louis), to whom Lucca was assigned in the meantime; while the Lorraines (in the person of Ferdinand III) returned to the Grand Duchy of Tuscany, increased by the State of the Presidi and the principality of Piombino. The State of the Church (under Pius VII) was reconstituted in its integrity, thanks largely to the efforts of Cardinal Ercole Consalvi, who succeeded in overcoming all opposition in Vienna and obtaining the return of Romagna, the Marches, Benevento and Pontecorvo, Austria reserving the right to retain garrisons in Ferrara and Comacchio. Similarly, the kingdom of Naples and Sicily was reconstituted in its integrity under the Bourbons (Ferdinand IV).

The Congress of Vienna was the most complete and impressive attempt ever hitherto made to adjust the political situation of Europe. It represented the affirmation of a principle of civilization, inasmuch as it represented an agreement between the Great Powers to adjust reciprocal interests by peaceful means and with a sense of balance and proportion, in order to achieve a stable European order, an order conceived as a supreme value to which individual aims and desires must be subordinated. However, this high purpose, which was affirmed in theory, and which, up to a certain point, the powers pursued with sincerity, was not the only factor that determined the decisions of the Congress. Each power had still endeavoured to contrive that its own interests would prevail; victorious Russia, Prussia and Austria enlarged their territories at the cost of Poland, the Rhine, the Saxon provinces, and Lombardo-Venetia, while France was reduced to her ancient frontiers. The guiding principles of the settlement might be reduced to two: the principle of the balance of power in Europe and the principle of legitimacy. In accordance with the first of these principles the territories and populations attributed to each power in the redistribution were weighed, so to speak, almost as though peoples and territories were material possessions. The second principle was based on the presumption that the kingdoms were the inalienable property of the sovereigns, conferred upon them by God; hence each of these sovereigns must enter into the possession of his realm and must not again be robbed of it. In reality even these two ideal

principles had suffered a number of violations by the Congress. While the Allies, as we have seen, were aggrandized, France was not, nor was the kingdom of Poland, which would have been a convenient buffer against the power of Russia, re-established in independence. Even less respect was paid to the principle of legitimacy; Poland was divided among other states, a number of German princes were despoiled of their territories, Saxony was halved, the Holy Roman Empire was no longer even a name, and the republics of Venice, Genoa and Lucca were not re-established. However we look at the matter, the application of these principles meant the return, pure and simple, to the Europe of 1789, to the *ancien regime*, as though the history of the years from 1789 to 1813 had never been; and such, indeed, was the intention of the members of the Congress, who did not accept the ideals of nationality and liberty, which implied the right of the peoples and of individuals to dispose of their own destinies, but held that it was the concern of the kings alone to provide for the prosperity of their subjects; that it was not for the latter to play any part in the determination and realization of their own welfare; that their rulers were in no sense responsible to their subjects, but that they derived their power solely and directly from God.

But since history cannot be erased nothing could cause the ideas and the events of the last thirty years to disappear without leaving a trace. The consciousness, if not of the peoples in the mass, yet at least of those classes of the population which form public opinion and direct events, had been penetrated by three ideas: the idea of the rights of the individual (personal liberty etc.); the idea that the State reposes on the consent of the collectivity, and that therefore the collectivity must have some means of influencing the government of the State; and lastly, the idea that the nations have the right to exist and evolve in liberty and independence. And it should be noted that these three ideas had contributed mightily to the anti-Napoleonic movement, exciting a violent reaction against the despotism of Napoleon and his policy of conquest, and that they had been utilized by the anti-Napoleonic coalition which had conquered him.

It would be erroneous, however, to believe that the process of reaction organized by the Congress of Vienna and continued by the

individual states was based entirely on force and arbitrary power; in that case it would have been of very brief duration. If the order imposed upon Europe in 1815 was maintained for many decades, this was partly due to the lassitude of the peoples, and to the disgust excited in them by the excesses of the Revolution, and even more by the despotism and ambition of Napoleon. Moreover, the ideas of legitimacy, of the absolute authority of the State, of the divine right of the sovereign, were actually in accordance with the convictions of many persons, and these ideas acquired greater potency from the fact that they had been recognized as just and righteous by religious authority, and especially by the authority of the Catholic religion, whose prestige, after the tempest of the Revolution, was not only restored, but appeared even greater than ever, nourished by a renaissance of piety and faith. On the other hand, the ideas of the Revolution had not penetrated very far into the consciousness of the peoples, but had remained the patrimony of the few, of persons belonging to the upper classes of the population, and even in these classes they had suffered a crisis of arrest and dissolution, provoked by a revival of traditional ideals, political and religious. From this complex of opposing material and moral forces a prolonged conflict was to result, from which, when the achievement of the Congress of Vienna had been demolished, there would emerge the Europe of to-day, and in that Europe a united, independent, and constitutional Italy.

A singular manifestation of the tendency of the European states to maintain the order which they had restored on the basis of principles in which the traditions of the old absolutist policy were combined with the influence of the religious revival of which we have spoken was the famous Treaty of the "Holy Alliance," whose text was drafted in Paris by the Tsar Alexander, who was peculiarly accessible to mystical ideas, and which was signed on the 26 September 1815 and published in 1816.

In this Treaty the three sovereigns of Russia, Austria and Prussia declared that they had acquired the conviction that the basis of the policy of states ought to be "the sublime truth which is taught us by the eternal religion of God the Saviour," and they therefore

proclaimed "their determination to take as their rule of conduct only the precepts of this holy religion, which are precepts of justice, charity, and peace." Henceforward, therefore, "in conformity with the words of Holy Scripture," they would remain united "by the bonds of a true and indissoluble fraternity"; they would lend one another, "on every occasion and in every situation assistance, aid and succour," regarding themselves "as delegated by Providence to govern three branches of the same family." Louis XVIII, the Prince Regent of England, and other lesser sovereigns gave their adhesion to the Treaty, which in the beginning was no more than a declaration of ideal principles, in itself of no practical value. But Prince Metternich contrived to make it an instrument of his policy, whose aim was the maintenance at any cost of the traditional order of the States, and the negation of all revolutionary ideas. But of even greater use to him than the Treaty itself was a more concrete agreement concluded by the four powers on the 20 November 1815, in which they renewed the Alliance of Chaumont, and which enabled Metternich to convoke conferences in which it was possible to establish the measures essential to the peace and stability of Europe. In this way was laid the foundation of the policy of intervention, a policy of which Metternich was the animating spirit, a policy directed toward maintaining intact the achievement of the Congress of Vienna and the restorations, and which was especially applicable to Italy.

§ 106. THE RESTORATION AND THE LIBERAL MOVEMENT.— In no European country, perhaps, was the restoration of the old order pushed so far as in Italy.

In Piedmont Victor Emmanuel I expected simply to go back twenty years as though nothing had happened in the meantime. The Code Napoléon was abolished, and so were nearly all the French laws; the old complicated and incoherent legislation was re-established, and with it the feudal privileges, primogeniture, the trusts, the special tribunals, ecclesiastical, military, etc., the old systems of law and penal procedure (flogging, the torture of the cord, etc.) and intolerance in respect of all other creeds than the Catholic. Moreover, in the army, the magistrature, the bureaucracy, all was as it was before the

Revolution, so that in order to discover what post a man held it was enough to refer to the old court almanack (the "Palmaverde") of 1798; so that generals and colonels who had fought through glorious campaigns under Napoleon were demoted to lower ranks under the command of old men who had long ago retired into private life. Public education was entrusted to the clergy, or placed under their direction. Even the aggrandizement of the State by the annexation of Genoa was not without its inconveniences, inasmuch as the people of Genoa naturally lamented the loss of their independence and cherished in their hearts a lively hatred of Piedmont.

Victor Emmanuel, however, maintained a resolute attitude in respect of Austria, baffling her attempts to retain possession of the Upper Novarese and to postpone the evacuation of her forces from Piedmont. He also rejected the Austrian proposal that he should participate in an Italian league, of which he would have been the president; however, he concluded a treaty of alliance with Austria. The hope of annexing Lombardy, disappointed by the Congress of Vienna, was not forgotten by the political leaders of Piedmont, who even went so far (as in a memorial presented to the Tsar Alexander in 1818) to envisage a kingdom of Upper Italy. Certain internal improvements were initiated when Prospero Baldo was called to office; he gave the government a more progressive lead and introduced useful reforms, though not without encountering strenuous opposition from the unrepentant conservatives.

The two Duchies of Parma and Piacenza and of Modena were governed very differently. In the former Marie Louise, with the assistance of the Austrian Count Neipperg, who became her morganatic husband after Napoleon's death, governed without any reactionary excesses, retaining the majority of the French laws and institutions. The Civil Code, the work of very capable Parmesan jurists, was promulgated in 1820. The citizens enjoyed very much greater liberty of speech and action than in the rest of Italy, while education, literature and science were fostered and encouraged.

Very different from this was the government of Francis IV of Habsburg-Lorraine, Duke of Modena, a man not devoid of energy and governmental ability; solicitous for the welfare of his subjects,



he sought to lessen the burden of taxation, and to ensure the prompt and scrupulous administration of justice; moreover, in case of need he was a generous giver. But he was an inveterate enemy of liberal ideas and all that might encourage them; his government was based on the repression of such ideas and the support of the privileged classes of the clergy and the nobility. At the same time it should be noted that he had aspirations toward political expansion, either in Piedmont—if and when the elder branch of the House of Savoy should become extinct—or in the Milanese itself, at the cost of Austria; and he even dreamt of a royal crown.

The State which was least affected by the altered conditions, and which had for the time being the best government, was undoubtedly Tuscany under Ferdinand III and his ministers Corsini and Fossombroni. Some of the French institutions were retained, and although the Code Napoléon was abolished, the Code Leopold, which was again introduced in its place, was itself a liberal and enlightened achievement. The ecclesiastical tribunal was not re-established; only a part of the ecclesiastical property incamerated was restored to the religious Orders; and the re-establishment of the Jesuits was prohibited. But the government was lacking in energy, so that, to quote Giusti, it enervated the people and sent them to sleep. Externally, subjection to Austria, with which power Tuscany had concluded a treaty of alliance, was inevitable; however, the Grand Duke sought by skilful manœuvring to retain his autonomy. In June 1824 he died and was succeeded by his son Leopold II (1824–1859), who continued to govern the country on the same lines.

In the Congress of Vienna Tuscany had begged in vain for the annexation of Lucca, but this was given to Marie Louise of Bourbon in exchange for Parma. The duchess governed with humanity, but she was a strict and almost bigoted Catholic, and she did not adopt the constitution of 1805, although by the terms of the Treaty of Vienna she ought to have done so. On her death in 1824 she was succeeded by her son Charles, who was not malicious, but unbalanced. He displayed liberal tendencies, and in 1832 he became a Protestant; but ten years later he abjured his adopted faith.

The Papal state was at first very badly governed by the prelate

Riverola; but matters were improved when Cardinal Consalvi returned from the Congress of Vienna. Consalvi, in addition to being very keenly solicitous for the prosperity of the people, was essentially a "government man" in his attitude to affairs; he appreciated the value of a firm and strongly centralized government, and felt that it was necessary to "balance the States of the Church against the other states of Europe," as had been said in the Papal *motu proprio* of 1816, which was inspired by such tendencies. In the State of the Church the administration of the provinces and the communes was ordered in accordance with a unique system; justice was reorganized; and many of the feudal rights were abolished. But the fundamental evils of the Papal regime remained: the multiplicity and disorder of the laws, consisting of a mixture of Roman law, canon law, Bulls, and magistrates' decisions; the ecclesiastical courts had very wide powers of jurisdiction (the Inquisition punished faults of a purely religious character, such as the non-observance of feasts of the Church, failure to keep fasts, etc.), thanks to which the people were subjected to the threefold supervision of the State, the bishop and the Holy Office; and laymen were excluded from the government. The ecclesiastical estates were restored; and the cardinal's endeavours to introduce more sweeping reforms and to improve education were unsuccessful. Education once more became very largely the monopoly of the Jesuits, whose Order Pius VII had re-established in 1814. As regards foreign policy, Consalvi refused an alliance with Austria, and maintained an extremely diffident attitude in respect of that power.

Ferdinand IV of Bourbon, returning to the throne of Naples, had guaranteed civil liberty, had undertaken that the sale of national and ecclesiastical property should be regarded as valid, and had pledged himself to maintain the existing civil and military administration. The provinces and communes were reorganized in accordance with a uniform and centralized system of the French type, while the French Code was replaced (1819) by that of the Two Sicilies, known as the *Codice Ferdinando*, which retained the general characteristics of the French code; the estates formerly confiscated were restored to the *émigrés*; entailed property was re-established; and in the Concordat negotiated with the pontiff (1818), while there was no longer

any illusion to the Papal suzerainty over Naples, the ecclesiastical authorities were granted the supervision of education, the censorship of the Press, and jurisdiction in matrimonial causes. Moreover, Ferdinand abolished the autonomy of Sicily by the decree of 8 December 1816, which united the island with Naples, and set aside not only the old constitution, but also that which he himself had proclaimed in 1812 (a modification of the former, very like the British Constitution, with the two chambers, Peers and Commons, who discussed and approved or rejected the laws proposed to the Crown); he also suppressed the Sicilian army and the Sicilian flag. In the Decree of Union Ferdinand IV styled himself "Ferdinand I King of The Two Sicilies." In the treaty of close alliance with Austria it was established that the kingdom should admit no changes that were not consistent with the old monarchical institutions and the principles adopted by the Emperor for the internal government of his Italian provinces.

In Lombardy and Venetia Austria had begun by abolishing all the Napoleonic institutions, promising, however, a form of government which would have regard for national rights. By the decree of 7 April 1815 the "Lombard-Venetian Kingdom" was created, with a viceroy at its head, two "Central Congregations," one for Lombardy and one for the Veneto, and Provincial Congregations; the administration of the commune was entrusted to a municipal council with a *podestà* at its head; all the organs of government, apart from the viceroy, being composed of local elements, and very largely of nobles. But the only function of the Central Congregations was to distribute the burden of taxation, the taxes having already been established by the Austrian government, and to submit to the government their votes on non-political questions. The Austrian code was introduced, which did not permit of public trials, nor did it allow the accused person to plead, while in urgent cases it sanctioned summary trials. Its penalties were death and imprisonment of two degrees of severity. Germans were appointed to the higher positions in the State. The Italian Army was disbanded; Italian garrisons were sent into the provinces of the Empire, while Italy was garrisoned with German, Slav and Hungarian troops. (The Croats were regarded with special abhorrence.) The police and the police censorship of

publications were given unlimited powers. The extremely heavy taxes constituted a fifth part of the total revenues of the Empire; so that Austria may be said to have subjected Lombardy-Venetia to a positive system of spoliation. As regards the clergy, the government continued in many respects the Josephine and Napoleonic traditions; where land held in mortmain by the Church had been incamerated it was retained, and the ecclesiastical tribunal or *foro* was not re-instituted. For the rest, the Austrian administration and Austrian justice had their merits; they were well organized, circumspect, and impartial where the interests of the State were not in question. The fundamental principle of government was that announced by the Emperor in 1814, when addressing the Lombard deputies in Paris: "The Lombards must forget to be Italian; obedience to my wishes will be the bond which will unite the Italian provinces to the rest of my States." This programme was realized by a degree of centralization which gave even the Austrian local authorities very little power.

Thus a completely foreign government, which deliberately chose to remain as such, was established in two of the largest and most important regions of Italy. Through them Austria was able to dominate practically the whole peninsula; and she enjoyed a distinct preponderance, as being by far the stronger, over all the rest of the Italian sovereigns. And further, however much the latter might long for independence, such desires were necessarily held in check by the consciousness that Austria was their standby in the event of internal disturbances, to say nothing of the fact that three of these princes were members of the House of Austria. And this tie was strengthened by the individual treaties which have already been mentioned.

The ideals of national independence and unity, of liberty and progress, which a minority of elect spirits, at the beginning of the 18th century, had believed to be within their reach, were now very far from realization. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to believe that there had hitherto been any profound discontent in the peninsula, or any common hope of a radical change. To begin with, it could not be said of any of the Italian governments—not even of the Austrian—that they were tyrannical in the usual sense of the word;

if one wished to define their character in specific terms one might say that they were absolutist governments, half patriarchal and half "enlightened." That is, they took meticulous pains to promote the material and everyday welfare of their subjects, a matter which the undeveloped popular consciousness regarded as of the greatest importance. And if we also take into account the lassitude, the longing for peace which the tumultuous Napoleonic era had left behind it, the conservative influence of religion, the network of vested interests with which every government surrounds itself, the profound differences between the various regions of Italy, which had been mutually separated for centuries, and the sparse diffusion of culture: if we consider all these factors we shall readily understand that the great majority of the Italian people felt quite at their ease under the Restoration.

And yet Italy was not "the country of the dead"; or rather, it was her dead who were helping to keep her alive. There was a national tradition, a national literature, a national history, an Italian people; Italy was something very different from a mere "geographical expression," though Metternich had believed that this was the proper definition of Italy. Classical and mediaeval memories, the traditions of local autonomy, the doctrines and reforms of the 18th century, and the recent lessons of the Revolution all fostered the ideals of liberty; the sense of nationality, the pride of the Italic race, which had created ancient Rome, and the oppressiveness of a foreign government made the Italians long for independence. Lastly—more timidly and uncertainly—there emerged the ideal of a united State, for which the national unity offered a solid foundation. The Italic Kingdom had given a name to the dream, and had even begun to realize it; painful experience would be needed to bring it to maturity. Yet these ideals, these feelings were entertained only by the few; the nobles, except in Lombardy, were essentially opposed to them, they were hateful to nearly all the clergy, and the peasants knew nothing of them. By the bourgeoisie, however, the most vital and industrious class of society, they were passionately cherished; all the more inasmuch as this was the class that suffered most under the Restoration government. For the Restoration filled the bureaucracy with nobles, mon-

signori and foreigners; it fettered industry and commerce by setting up customs barriers, by the lack of uniformity in respect of weights and measures; by its distrustful vigilance, by minute and vexatious regulations, by the inadequacy of its administrative and judicial organs, it prevented the diffusion of culture; in short, it impeded all those forms of activity in which the middle class found its natural vocation. The numerous universities, some of which were very advanced, nourished in the hearts of the bourgeoisie the ideals of nationality and liberty, and intolerance for the existing state of things.

Few in number, subject to the surveillance of authorities who sought to check them at every step, the Italian patriots and liberals were compelled, as were patriots and liberals abroad, to conspire in the meetings of secret societies. The origin, constitution, and programme of these societies are wrapped in the greatest obscurity; but they probably had a common parent in Freemasonry (§ 100), which in the Revolutionary and Napoleonic era was widely diffused in Italy.

Foremost among these societies was the *Carboneria*, which apparently ended by absorbing others, such as the society of *Guelfi* in Lombardy and Romagna. These were the partisans of Italian independence, the promoters of a league between the various states, probably under the presidency of the Pope. The Carboneria took its name, symbolically, from *carbone*, coal, which is black, but on being kindled burns with a bright flame. The associates were organized in *vendite*, and, as in Masonry, they had a number of symbols, rites, ceremonies, and oaths. They were Christians, and inspired by a certain degree of mysticism; Christ, for them, was the first victim of the tyrants. Exactly what their programme was has never been clearly understood. Of course, they wanted a constitution, and they wanted an independent Italy; some of them were republicans, but the activities of Carbonarism were never inspired by republican or unitarian ideals. Their doctrines have been described as "a strange mixture of Roman imperialism and democratic semi-Socialism of the school of Jean-Jacques Rousseau." The Carboneria was constituted in Southern Italy, during the reign of Joseph Bonaparte and Murat, when it had the character of a resolute opposition to the French government.

It was therefore encouraged by King Ferdinand; but it became his enemy when it was seen that he did not intend to grant a constitution. From the south it spread into the Papal State and the north; in Piedmont it was amalgamated with the *Adelfi*, giving birth to the *Federati*, whose programme comprised a kingdom of Upper Italy under the House of Savoy, and an Italian Confederation; in Lombardy Piero Maroncelli formed a *vendita* at Milan, enlisting Silvio Pellico and Count Porro; another of the same way of thinking was Count Federico Confalonieri, leader of the *Federati* of Lombardy, whose principal aim was the expulsion of the Austrians; while the idea of union with Piedmont had as yet hardly dawned upon them.

Confalonieri and Porro, with the rest of their group, since they could not for the time being attempt any actual political *coup*, devoted themselves to social, economic and educational activities; they introduced the steamboat, the spinning-jenny, etc., and promoted elementary education; they allied themselves with the Romantic movement as against the classicism fostered by Austria, which "defended grammar and the principle of authority and the Pope," and they founded the *Conciliatore*. The members of the staff of this periodical, who met at Porro's house, were finally regarded as conspirators by the government; and the *Conciliatore*, after a year of life, during which it had trouble with the censorship, was suppressed (1819).

In addition to the Carboneria and other circles of a liberal character there were some which supported the constituted order, and whose purpose was to assist the cause of reaction. There was much talk of the *Concistoriali*, who were said to be protected by the Duke of Modena, and whose aim, it was believed, was to reorganize Italy by agreement with the Pope and the clergy, expelling the Austrians (who were hostile to the Papal clergy on account of their "Josephinism"). The *Sanfedisti*, in the Papal State, were supposed to be definitely clerical in character, and opposed to liberalism. But little is known of this group; indeed, its very existence has been disputed. The *Calderari*, in the kingdom of Naples, were said to be a branch of the *Sanfedisti*. They certainly existed, for they were protected by the Prince of Canosa, Ferdinand's minister, until the king was urged by Austria to dismiss Canosa and dissolve the society.

The first *coup* of the Carboneria took place in the Papal State, at Macerata, in June 1817; but it was of little significance. However, the trial of the conspirators ended with a number of capital sentences (afterwards commuted to imprisonment for life) and sentences of imprisonment for life or a term of years.

During the first fifteen years of the Restoration the national movement in Italy was closely related, both intellectually and in fact, with similar movements abroad, especially in France. All these movements fed on their memories of the Revolution and the Napoleonic period. Napoleon, dethroned and exiled by the Holy Alliance, became a symbol of liberty, in Italy and elsewhere. The armies were incubators of the liberal movements. There was at that time in Europe a common public opinion and a common mentality, so that the happenings in one country had their immediate repercussions in the others.



## CHAPTER XVIII

### *THE RISORGIMENTO*

§ 107. THE ITALIAN REVOLUTIONS OF 1820-1821. —The connection between the political movements in Italy and those which occurred in other European countries was made manifest by the Italian revolutions of 1820-1821, which were a repercussion of the Spanish revolution of January 1820. This had broken out in the army, and its programme was the Spanish Constitution of 1812, promulgated by the Cortes during the war against Napoleon, and abolished immediately upon the restoration of the Bourbon King Ferdinand VII. In this were declared the principles of national sovereignty and the separation of powers; unity of legislation, the irremovability of magistrates, individual liberty and liberty of the Press were established, while torture and the confiscation of property were abolished; the executive power was confided to the king, assisted by seven ministers and a Council of State, and the legislative power to the Cortes, elected for two years by indirect (threefold) suffrage. The Catholic religion was declared the religion of the State, and all other religions were prohibited; and in the place of the Inquisition, which was suppressed, tribunals were created to "protect the Faith."

The Spanish revolution was already triumphant by March 1820, when the king made his submission. In Naples the success of the revolution was even more rapid; but here it was put through by the Army, which was largely penetrated by the Carboneria. On the 2 July 1820 two cavalry officers, Morelli and Silvati, deserted at Nola with a detachment of cavalry and marched upon Avellino with the cry of "King and Constitution." In a very few days the movement had spread to Terra di Lavoro, the Capitanata, Basilicata, and Apulia. The leader of the insurrection was Guglielmo Pepe, an ex-general of Murat's, about whom there gathered a strong nucleus of troops. On the 6 July the king, seeing that the army was completely won over

by the revolution, announced in a proclamation the concession of the constitution, formed a new ministry composed of "Murattiani," and appointed as regent his son, Francesco, Duke of Calabria. On the 7 July the regent, under pressure from the Carbonari, proclaimed the Spanish Constitution of 1812, and on the 13th the king swore allegiance to it upon the Bible. But the new order was to some extent undermined by the conflict between the "Murattiani" who had been called to office (they were moderate Constitutionalists) and the Carbonari, who had brought about the revolution.

In Palermo, after the first enthusiasm for the Neapolitan revolution, there suddenly emerged a movement, promoted by the nobles, in favour of an autonomous government and the Sicilian Constitution of 1812, and this movement, not without rioting and pillage, spread throughout the island. The Liberals of Naples were extremely hostile to it, and Florestano Pepe, the brother of Guglielmo, was sent to Sicily with seven thousand men. He managed to come to an understanding with the governmental *giunta* which had set itself up in Palermo, on the basis of the proclamation of an amnesty and the convocation of an assembly, which was to deliberate on the alternative of union or autonomy (22 September). There was an insurrection of the discontented populace, and Pepe was compelled to attack the rebels on land and at sea. On the 5 October the convention was renewed, with the proviso that in any event Sicily would remain under the king of Naples and accept the Spanish constitution. In Naples, meanwhile, Parliament was assembled (1 October). It consisted of a majority of moderate Liberals, and before the assembly the king once more swore fidelity to the Constitution. The Parliament refused to ratify the convention with the Sicilians, and despatched General Pietro Coletta to the island, which he subjected to severe repression.

In the congress of the five Great Powers assembled at Troppau (October–November 1820) France and England were not in favour of an intervention to abolish the Neapolitan Constitution, but the powers of the Holy Alliance decided upon intervention, renewing the proclamation of the right of intervention in states where changes had been effected by illegal means; and they invited the King of Naples to attend a new Congress convoked at Lubiana. The king, in

accordance with the Spanish Constitution, had to ask the Parliament for permission to leave the realm; this he obtained after protesting that he would defend the cause of the Constitution before the Congress. But once at Lubiana the king proved to be more absolutist than the powers of the Holy Alliance, and it was only with difficulty that he was persuaded to give his consent to a plan of reform. The Parliament, on receiving the king's request that it would submit itself to the will of the powers, and on learning that the intervention of Austria had been decided upon, voted in favour of resistance, declaring that it regarded the king as a prisoner. The regent proclaimed his fidelity to the cause of the Constitution. But no serious defence could be made against Austria; of the forty or fifty thousand men who were mustered half consisted of provincial militia, and moreover, they were divided into two bodies, one on the Garigliano, under Carascosa, and the other, under Guglielmo Pepe, in the Abruzzi. The latter crossed the frontier, but near Rieti (7 March) it encountered the Austrian army, which had marched southwards from the Lombard and Venetian kingdom. It was driven back, and began to retreat, when the militia decamped. Carascosa's army, which did not move, was weakened by serious defections; so that on the 23 March the Austrian army was able to enter Naples without encountering resistance.

While the revolution in Naples was ended, another had broken out in Piedmont. Here again the Carboneria had taken root in the army; it was a sort of rendezvous for all those who for personal or ideological reasons were hostile to the Restoration. The movement was monarchical and Savoyard; the revolutionaries wished Victor Emmanuel I to grant the Constitution and to march against Austria, reviving the old ambition of the House of Savoy to unite Lombardy and Piedmont. The leaders of the movement were Carlo Asinari di San Marzano, colonel aide-de-camp to the king, Major Giacinto di Collegno, equerry to the Prince of Carignano, Major Santorre di Santa Rosa, and Colonel Regis. The Lombard Federati, the Carbonari of Romagna and the Marches, did not lack adherents among the intelligentsia. Charles Albert, a royal prince of the younger branch of the family of Savoia-Carignano, a descendant of Prince Tommaso (§ 95), who, since Victor Emmanuel and his brother Charles had no

sons, was the presumptive heir to the throne, sympathized with the Carbonari and was in communication with them. When the revolution broke out in Spain and in Naples there was great and increasing excitement in Piedmont, and there were even the beginnings of a rising—for example, in Turin, on the 12 January 1821, there was a clash between the students of the university and the police—but the position was not serious, and the Austrian army was able to march southwards to Naples unhindered. At last, early in March, the Carbonari decided to take action, and they sought to come to an understanding with the Prince of Carignano. He, according to the subsequent account of Santa Rosa, began by acquiescing in the rising; then he prohibited it; then again he gave his approval. On the 10 March the Spanish Constitution was proclaimed in the citadel of Alessandria, and a governmental *giunta* was set up in this city. The proclamation of the *giunta* spoke of the Spanish Constitution, of Italian independence and an Italian federation, and of Victor Emmanuel and the future King of Italy. The Italian tricolour was hoisted. Two days later the same thing happened in the citadel of Turin; the king abdicated, confiding the regency to the Prince of Carignano pending the arrival of Charles Felix, who was then in Modena. Carignano, under the now menacing pressure of the insurgents, granted the Spanish Constitution, excepting for such modifications as the national representatives and the king might decide to make (13 March). He then appointed a new ministry and a governmental *giunta*. During the next few days he wrote to various governors, warning them to regard the concession as void until the king had declared his will, and concentrating those regiments which were still loyal in Novara. Charles Felix sent from Modena an edict in which he declared that the abdication and the regency were annulled, and that all who supported the constitutional movement were rebels; at the same time he ordered Charles Albert to go to General de la Tour in Novara and there await his further orders. Charles Albert did not publish the edict; he announced in a proclamation that the king had replied in such terms as to persuade him that he was not fully informed as to the situation, and that it would be necessary to enlighten him; and on the 21st he appointed Santa Rosa Minister for War. But at midnight of the same day he fled, with such

troops as he could muster, from Turin to Novara, and then, in obedience to orders from Charles Felix, he repaired *via* Milan and Modena (where the king refused to see him) to Florence, to his father-in-law the Grand Duke of Tuscany. Thus the Constitutionalist were now in the position of rebels. The *giunta* of Alessandria remained at its post, while Santorre di Santa Rosa prepared to offer resistance, and, crossing the Ticino, to march into Lombardy, but Confalonieri, in Milan, dissuaded them from such a venture. Russia attempted mediation, but in vain; the Austrians, under Bubna, crossed the Ticino; near Novara, at the first encounter, the Constitutionalist dispersed (8 April). The Genoese, who in the meantime had risen on behalf of the Constitution, did not attempt to offer resistance.

Thus both the Italian revolutions had failed. The absence of any sort of agreement between them, and even more than this, all that had happened in Sicily, showed that the ideal of national unity was as yet anaemic and uncertain. Not only the populace, but even the middle classes had failed to play any real part in the movement; it had been essentially an officers' and nobles' revolution. The very leaders of the insurrection cherished ideas which were at once too indefinite and too sweeping; at a single step they wanted to pass from the absolutist regime to the Constitution of Spain, without really knowing the substance of the latter. They were wanting in unity of aim, in organization, in practicality and constancy. These were the inevitable defects of an incipient movement. Italy could not transform herself and rise from the past in a single moment; for that she would have needed a less superficial education, wider experience, and the more general participation of all classes in the movement. Moreover, she should have waited until the international situation had changed; for so long as Europe remained the Europe of the Congress of Lubiana an Italian *risorgimento* was almost or entirely impossible. In the meantime these movements had shown that the ideals of liberty and independence, and even of Italian unity, were beginning to make their way, and this without encountering excessive hostility from the majority of the nation. They had also shown that principles alone, without the support of Austria, were not strong enough to prevent their triumph.

§ 108. THE REACTION. THE TRIALS IN LOMBARDY-VENETIA AND THE SPIELBERG.—In the Kingdom of Naples, after King Ferdinand's return, sentences of the greatest severity were inflicted upon the Constitutionalists. Morelli and Silvati were hanged; many others were flung into prison, where they were subjected to the harshest treatment, and forced to associate with common criminals. Others—many of whom were sentenced to death—were found guilty of the crime of belonging to a secret society, or of committing seditious actions. At Cosenza the members of the secret society of the *Cavalieri europei riformati* were tried; they were treated with abominable cruelty, and three of them were sentenced to death. Guglielmo Pepe and others fled the country, the first of that company of exiles who during the Risorgimento made all Europe aware of the desires and the sufferings of Italy. In the army, the administration, and the clergy there were extensive purges of liberal elements. Repressive measures were adopted in respect of the Press; indeed, repression even went so far as to burn the Catechism, because it numbered, among the duties of man, the love of country. The observance of religious duties was subjected to supervision; education was entrusted almost exclusively to the clergy, including the Jesuits; the formation of a society for the cultivation of mulberries and the promotion of a gas company were prohibited, because such societies "enlighten the people and diffuse liberal ideas." Meanwhile the general condition of the kingdom was deteriorating; venality and corruption prevailed in the courts and the administration; the public debt was increasing at an extraordinary rate, for the State finances had to bear the expenses of the Austrian occupation, which, being continued until 1824, cost more than 300 million lire.

In such wise did King Ferdinand, dying suddenly on the 4 January 1825, end the sixty-five years of his reign, which had begun with Tanucci's reforms. He was succeeded by his son Francis I (1825–1830), under whom the government continued on the same lines. The factions were still active; especially the *Filadelfi*, in Cilento, where Florestano Pepe maintained an intelligence department. In June 1828 the people of the commune of Bosco (Salerno) rose in response to the appeal of the octogenarian Canon de Luca, proclaiming the French

Constitution. This movement, which spread to the adjacent districts, was quickly repressed by the efforts of Colonel Del Carretto, who burned Bosco and razed it to the ground; twenty-six persons were sent to the scaffold, among them de Luca.

In Piedmont also there were many sentences of death, but all the offenders were sentenced *in contumacio*, with two exceptions (Laneri and Garelli, who were executed). A number of refugees took up arms in support of the Spanish and Greek Revolutions; among those who went to Greece was Santa Rosa, "he who sleeps at Sphakteria." The regiments which had taken part in the rebellion were dissolved; restrictive measures were adopted with regard to university students, who were subjected to the most careful surveillance, even in respect of their religious practices. Here too education was entrusted to the clergy—and above all to the Jesuits—or was placed under clerical supervision.

The Lombard Carbonari, as we have seen, were more or less in touch with those of Piedmont, and particularly with Confalonieri, but they had not decided upon any concrete and positive course of action; as to the rest, the Austrian police knew nothing of their doings. However, in October 1820 Maroncelli was arrested, and then, in consequence of his imprudent confessions, Silvio Pellico. Other arrests followed, among them that of the eminent jurist, Giandomenico Romagnosi. He was afterwards released, but Maroncelli and Pellico, as Carbonari, were sentenced to death (6 December 1821). In the case of Maroncelli the Emperor commuted the capital sentence to twenty years' imprisonment; in the case of Pellico, to fifteen years. Both were sent to the Spielberg in Moravia.

In the meantime the police had begun to suspect the complicity of the Lombard Carbonari in the Piedmontese risings. On the 13 December 1821 Confalonieri was arrested; but before and after this date other arrests were made: of Pallavicino, Borsieri and others. Repeated and invidious interrogations, often protracted for hours, and even made unexpectedly in the middle of the night, together with bad treatment and enforced fasting, extorted confessions or involuntary admissions from some of the accused. In 1823 there were still more extensive trials. The accusations were: the constitution of the society of the Federati, making preparations for a rising in Lombardy to

coincide with the invasion of Piedmont, and plotting the assassination of General Bubna, which someone does appear to have envisaged. In this year of 1823 Confalonieri, Borsieri and Pallavicino were at last sentenced to death, and with them thirteen others, nine of them, however, *in contumacia*. In the case of the former the death-sentence was commuted to one of *carcere duro* in the Spielberg; Confalonieri for the term of his natural life, Borsieri and Pallavicino for twenty years. Other capital sentences, which were likewise commuted, were imposed in 1824. In the case of Confalonieri the commutation was obtained by the efforts of his parents and his wife, who went to Vienna to plead his cause before the Emperor. The sentences produced a great impression in Milan, where they were regarded as a civic bereavement.

In Venetia too there were arrests and trials of Carbonari and Guelfi, sentence being passed in December 1821; here again in the case of thirteen prisoners the death-sentence was commuted to one of imprisonment in the Spielberg or at Lubiana. Among those sent to the Spielberg was Oroboni, of whom Pellico speaks in *Mie prigioni*.

And so the Spielberg was filled with Lombard and Venetian prisoners. Confined in narrow, pestilential, dimly lit cells, with a plank for bed, heavily chained, with clothing as harsh as a hair-shirt, and nourished, if one may use the word, on a scanty and nauseous diet; inspected thrice daily, deprived of books and of any occupation but that of splitting wood and picking lint and knitting stockings—so they endured the long years of their imprisonment; and it is a wonder that they all did not die or become insane. But in 1830 Silvio Pellico and Maroncelli were pardoned; in 1835 Borsieri; in 1836 Confalonieri. Oroboni died in 1823.

In 1820 and 1821 there were no risings in the Marches and Romagna, although the Carbonari were numerous there, especially in Romagna (where there is good reason to suspect that they supported Austria in her designs upon the Legations). But there were agitators and suspects, and men were tried and sentenced. In Romagna there began in 1821 the series of political assassinations which were long a characteristic of this region; the Papal police could neither prevent them nor discover the culprits. A Papal Bull of the 13 September 1821



pronounced excommunication against the Carbonari and against those who failed to denounce them.

On the 20 August 1823 Pius VII died. The Conclave elected Annibale della Genga, the candidate of Consalvi's opponents, who took the name of Leo XII (1823-1829). Consalvi was deprived of his office as Secretary of State; he died in the January of the following year, and the reaction proceeded to undo his work. Leo XII was a man of vigorous character, stern, almost despotic, absolutely hostile to all liberal ideas, and a champion of Papal theocracy. His chief solicitude was to enforce, by inquisitorial supervision, the strict observance of Catholic morality and the Catholic religion; he reorganized the education of the young, but entrusted it exclusively to the clergy; he modified in a retrograde sense the administrative and judicial ordinances of Consalvi, granting privileges to the clergy and the nobles; and he attempted to repress the brigands who infested the south of Latium. To Romagna, where there was intense and even sanguinary hostility between the Nationalists and the Liberals, he despatched Rivarola, who staged a great trial, which ended with the sentence of 31 August 1825, by which seven persons were condemned to death, a sentence commuted to one of twenty-five years' detention, except in the case of two of the accused, condemned *in contumacia*—while more than a hundred persons were sent to the galleys or imprisoned for life or a term of years. In Rome two Carbonari, Targhini and Montanari, were hanged in the Piazza del Popolo on the 23 November 1825. In Romagna an attempt upon the life of Cardinal Rivarola was followed by nine condemnations.

Leo XII was succeeded by Pius VIII (Castiglioni, 1829-1870), elected in preference to the candidate of the zealots, Mauro Cappellari of Camaldola, who had his revenge in the next Conclave, which followed not long afterwards, when he took the name of Gregory XVI (1831-1846).

§ 109. THE REVOLUTION OF 1831 IN CENTRAL ITALY.—The Holy Alliance completed its work of repression by stifling the Spanish revolution, delegating the work to France. Charles Albert of Carignano, a dashing soldier, fought as a volunteer with the French

expedition, being anxious to rehabilitate himself in the eyes of Charles Felix and the absolute sovereigns. He took part in the siege of Cadiz, and was present at the storming of the fort of Trocadero (1823). The fall of Cadiz (1 October) decided the fate of the Spanish revolution.

Bourbon France, though abolishing the Spanish Constitution, had nevertheless retained the constitutional Charter which Louis XVIII had promulgated at the time of his restoration in 1814. The Liberal Constitutional movement, both in Parliament and outside it, made skilful use of the liberties conceded by this Charter, while behind it there fermented the Republican movement, steeped in revolutionary and Napoleonic memories. The wars of independence in which Latin America was victorious over Spain, and Greece over Turkey, helped to keep the liberal and revolutionary ideal alive in Europe. Under Charles X, who in 1824 had succeeded his brother Louis XVIII, the opposition to the Bourbon regime became more widespread and more accentuated. On the 26 July 1830 the king, by a *coup d'état*, issued four anti-constitutional ordinances. In Paris this was followed by the insurrection of the "Three Glorious Days" (27–29 July), which ended in the dethronement of Charles X and the proclamation as "King of the French" of the Duke of Orléans, of the cadet branch of the family: Louis Philippe I (1830–1848). Various changes were made in the Constitution.

The July Revolution had its repercussions throughout Europe, but its effects were most considerable in Belgium, Poland and Italy. In Paris a group of Italian Carbonari had constituted the *Società dell'italiana emancipazione*, which included among its members Pepe, Porro, and Maroncelli after his liberation from the Spielberg. This society was in touch with the French republicans, so that the Carbonari of France and Italy were thus closely related. According to a very widespread belief, in the days preceding the July Revolution, and during the early years of the Orléans monarchy, a complete plan of action was worked out by the French and Italians, under the patronage of Louis Philippe himself. The latter was said to be in close relations with the Duke of Modena, Francis IV, who, although his government was reactionary, and although he had savagely persecuted the Carbonari—there was the famous Rubiera trial, which sent

the priest Andreoli to the scaffold (1822)—was still ambitious, still hoped to enlarge his dominions, and was even intriguing, in vain, for the succession to the throne of Sardinia (§ 107). It was said that a proposal had been made to the duke, though his French agent, Misley, sent to Italy by La Fayette, for a constitutional kingdom consisting of Lombardy, Parma and Tuscany, in exchange for the support which he would have to give in return—even with his personal fortune—to the French and Spanish Liberals.

All this is rather romantic, and extremely doubtful. Yet one thing is certain—that Misley, a Carbonaro, was in touch with the duke, and also with Ciro Menotti, who had been arrested in 1820, and to whom he must have divulged something of his plans. But what was of capital importance for the Italian revolutionaries was the proclamation by the new French government, with Laffitte at its head, of the principle of non-intervention, which authorized them to regard themselves as safeguarded against an Austrian attack. During the Conclave which elected Gregory XVI (§ 108) a group of conspirators, one of whom was Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, the nephew of Napoleon I and the son of King Louis of Holland, had attempted a *coup* which was a complete fiasco. Now preparations were made for the outbreak of an insurrection in Bologna and Modena. In Modena the duke, scenting the imminence of the outbreak, had Menotti's house surrounded on the night of 3 February 1831, when he and the other conspirators who had assembled there were captured. But on the following day the insurrection broke out in Bologna and in the duchy; the duke fled to Mantua, taking Menotti with him. Marie Louise also fled from Parma to Piacenza, where there was an Austrian garrison, and the revolution spread into the rest of Romagna, and into the Marches and Umbria. In less than a fortnight the Liberals, who encountered no serious opposition, were in power in the Papal State—with the exception of Latium—and in the Duchies—excepting Piacenza. The provisional government which had constituted itself in Bologna, under the presidency of Giovanni Vicini, convoked an assembly of representatives of the insurgent Papal provinces. Meeting on the 26th, the assembly decreed the abolition of the temporal power and the union of the Liberal provinces under the name of the "United Italian Pro-

vinces," and proclaimed a provisional constitution. But it had not the courage to attack Rome, although an insurrection had broken out there—which was quickly repressed—and having complete confidence in the policy of non-intervention, it did not organize the defence against Austria.

Metternich, on the other hand, had plainly told France that he did not renounce the right of intervention, and he prepared to invade Italy. Laffitte was in favour of preventing the invasion, even if it meant war; not so Louis Philippe, who thought of nothing but consolidating his position in the company of European monarchs. He replaced Laffitte by Casimir-Périer (13 March), who reduced the principle of non-intervention to a mere diplomatic affirmation, declaring: "The blood of Frenchmen belongs to France alone." On the 9 March the Austrians escorted the duke to Modena, and on the 13th they entered Parma. The few Modenese who had taken up arms under General Zucchi retreated into Emilia, where the Provisional Government, hypnotized by the formula of non-intervention, disarmed them. At last, as the Austrians approached, Zucchi himself was given command of the forces of Bologna and Modena—5,000 ill-armed and undisciplined men against 15,000 Austrians. The Austrians entered Bologna on the 21 March; on the 25th, at Rimini, they repulsed Zucchi's forces, which retired in good order. On the 26th the Provisional Government, withdrawing from Bologna to Ancona, signed a capitulation with Cardinal Benvenuti, the Papal Legate, who had been taken prisoner, obtaining a complete amnesty. But Gregory XVI refused to recognize the capitulation; the insurgent leaders, embarking at Ancona, were captured by the Austrian admiral, Bandiera, and after nine months of imprisonment in Venice they were transferred to Civitavecchia, whence after their release they went into exile.

The first victim of the return of Francis IV was Ciro Menotti, who on the 26 May suffered the extreme penalty, together with Vincenzo Borelli, who had also taken part in the revolution. There were no other executions, but many were condemned to the galleys, and the number of such sentences increased in the following years. The government continued arbitrary and reactionary, though it did

something in the way of promoting education, erecting public buildings, and improving communications. Duke Francis IV, who died in 1846, was succeeded by his son Francis V.

In the Papal State an amnesty was granted in respect of the events of 1831, with the exclusion of some thirty persons who were more especially compromised, but were in safety. The powers themselves were persuaded of the necessity of change, and in a collective memorandum dated the 21 May 1831, Austria, Russia, Prussia, France, Great Britain and Sardinia proposed reforms in the judiciary and administrative order: unrestricted admission of the laity to all public offices, organization of municipalities and provincial councils, institution of a Court of Accounts and a State Consulta. These proposals were accepted only in part by the edict of the 5 July, by which it was enacted that at the head of the provinces there must be a legate (cardinal) or a delegate (a prelate simply), assisted by a governmental assembly (congregation) appointed by the sovereign, and that communal councils should be instituted, composed of "ancients," with a *gonfaloniere* and a prior at their head.

But such reforms failed to give satisfaction, especially in the Legations, where almost as soon as the Austrian troops had been withdrawn there were fresh disturbances and insurrections, ending in the constitution of autonomous governments. Cardinal Bernetti, Secretary of State, after some temporizing, called in the Papal forces in order to avoid a fresh Austrian occupation. Having dispersed a few bodies of volunteers, on the 20 January 1832 the Papal troops occupied Cesena, pillaging and killing unarmed citizens. On the 21st there was a sanguinary conflict between the soldiers and the populace at Forlì, and in order to make an end of such resistance the Austrian troops returned; they were less hateful to the people than the Papal forces, because they were more disciplined. The French, to counterbalance the Austrian occupation, landed a garrison at Ancona (22 February). Affrays and assassinations continued to disturb the Marches and the Legations; and in order to suppress the rebellious elements Bernetti organized a corps of local volunteers, the *centurioni*, who were as bad as those whom they were expected to suppress. At last it seemed that the situation was beginning to be a little

quieter, and in 1838 the French and the Austrians evacuated the region.

§ 110. GIUSEPPE MAZZINI AND "YOUNG ITALY."—The Italian revolutions of 1820–1821 and 1831, inspired and directed by the Carboneria, were the repercussions of those that had taken place in Spain and France. The second of these revolutions had relied very largely for its success on the policy of the French government. Both revolutions were regional rather than national in character, and they had not attacked the problem of the creation of a new and united Italy. They were inspired mainly by the desire to resume the work of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic period.

The failure of the revolution of 1831 signified also the final failure of the Carboneria, which after this date may be said to have outlived itself, lingering longest in Romagna and the Marches. Its failure had been due to its vague programme, its inadequate organization, and its wretched leadership, together with contrary circumstances. But conditions in Italy were still such that any political activity in the nationalist interest was bound to be very largely secret; so the Carboneria and the other associations were replaced by another secret society, "Young Italy" (*Giovine Italia*), of a very different kind. There was no longer a host of societies, with different names and different programmes; there was a single association, with a precise programme, matured and formulated by one energetic and indefatigable leader, Giuseppe Mazzini.

Giuseppe Mazzini was born in Genoa, in 1805. His early environment was inspired by republican traditions, and had little love for the Savoyard dynasty. In 1821, when still a boy, he had been profoundly impressed by the sight of some Piedmontese refugees who were embarking to go into exile. In 1827 he was enrolled in the Carboneria, and in 1830 he was arrested and confined in the fortress of Savona, where his political ideas had begun to mature. As an exile in Marseilles he came into contact with the refugees in 1831; and the manner in which the rising of 1831 had been conducted, and its failure, finally convinced him of the defects of the Carboneria. It was necessary, according to him, that the movement for the resurrection of Italy

## *A CONCISE HISTORY OF ITALY*

should not be confined to the empirically political activities of a few individuals or of certain classes, but that there must be a profound and ample movement of spiritual renewal, which should above all be of a religious and moral character; it must therefore be based on a firm and profound faith in God, and in humanity, the depositary of the Divine law of progress; a faith which must appeal to and take possession of the whole people. The people must not look to their sovereigns for salvation; they must achieve it by their own efforts; and political must be accompanied by social redemption. The Italian revolution was to be merely the realization for Italy of a programme that was destined to transform the whole of humanity, and which could be summed up in the three words: "God and people."

Italy's part, in this work of human redemption, was that of initiator and propagandist, so that her cause would become the cause of humanity itself, acquiring a universal function, a universal value, and as protagonist of this cause an Italian Rome must take the place of an Imperial and Papal Rome. Under Italian guidance the peoples, allied against their rulers, must constitute the free and solidary national societies by whose co-operation (each contributing in its own degree and in its specific manner) an associated and redeemed Humanity would arise, evolving, on a path of unlimited progress, toward a Divine sublimation.

Inspired by such ideas, Mazzini founded in 1831, at Marseilles, the society "Young Italy." He defined its programme thus: "Young Italy is the brotherhood of Italians believing in a law of Progress and Duty, who being convinced that Italy is called upon to become a nation, that she can make herself such by her own efforts . . . that the secret of power resides in unity and constant effort, consecrate thought and action, joined in unity, to the great purpose of making Italy a nation of free and equal citizens. One, Independent, Sovereign." —"Young Italy is republican and unitarian, republican because all the men of a nation are required by the laws of God and Humanity to be freemen, equals, and brothers, and the institution of the republic is the only one that can assure this result; unitarian because without unity there is no strength, and Italy, surrounded by powerful and jealous unitarian nations, must needs before all things be strong."

The great political novelty of this programme was the idea of Italian unity, which had hitherto been but the vague mirage of the very few, and which no one else had professed in so precise and resolute a form. Such an idea, presented by Mazzini with the intimate enthusiasm, the exalted idealism which were peculiarly his own, made him one of the principal artisans of the new Italy.

Mazzini began the work of propaganda and organization immediately. Groups of members of the new society sprang up on every hand: in Genoa, under Jacopo and Giovanni Ruffini, in Tuscany, under Guerrazzi and Bini, in Romagna, under Luigi Carlo Farini, in Umbria, under Francesco Guardabassi, and indeed in almost every part of Italy, attracting to themselves the remnants of the Carboneria. From the beginning of the year 1832, and until 1834, a periodical was published, with the title *Giovine Italia*, which Mazzini endeavoured to distribute throughout the peninsula. This was the beginning of his work as a writer, continued afterwards in other periodicals and in pamphlets, and also in an extremely active correspondence, which gave him a distinguished position in the political, moral and religious literature of Italy.

Meanwhile Charles Felix, the last direct heir of the House of Savoy, was succeeded on the throne of Sardinia (April 1831) by Charles Albert of Savoia-Carignano, the Prince Regent of 1821, who had been involved in the Carbonarist movements. After what had happened in 1821 the question of excluding the Prince of Carignano from the succession had been raised by Charles Felix, who would have preferred to replace Charles Albert by his son, Victor Emmanuel (b. 1820). Austria was opposed to this, and the proposal was abandoned; however, in December 1823 the prince was required to sign a declaration by which he pledged himself to preserve the fundamental bases and the organic forms of the monarchy. For that matter, this pledge was quite consonant with the prince's new opinions, for he had become extremely averse to liberalism, and he concluded a formal treaty of alliance with Austria.

Nevertheless, his accession to the throne revived many hopes. Giuseppe Mazzini himself, notwithstanding his republican programme, addressed to the prince a letter published at Marseilles in 1831, urging



him to the great undertaking of making himself King of Italy. But the new king did nothing in response to this appeal, and by the end of the year Mazzini expressed his discouragement, and intensified his revolutionary propaganda in the Savoyard state. When in 1833 it was discovered that this was at work in the army extremely severe repressive measures were taken; twenty-seven persons were condemned to death, twelve of whom were executed (and of these Andrea Vochieri, shot at Alessandria, was especially remembered for his patriotism and his nobility of mind), while many were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment, and to exile. Among the exiles was the priest Vincenzo Gioberti. In Genoa Jacopo Ruffini, a very dear friend of Mazzini's, committed suicide in prison.

For incidents of much less gravity than those of 1821 and 1831 Charles Albert's repressive measures had been more severe; it is therefore not to be wondered at that he became the object of the execration of the Liberals, and above all of Mazzini and his friends, who considered the question of assassinating the king, and organized an insurrection in Savoy. Savoy was invaded by a column of little more than a thousand men, refugees from Italy and other nations; but the expedition, commanded by Gerolamo Ramorino, reduced to the ranks for having fought for the Poles, dispersed after a skirmish (February 1834). At the same time another insurrection was to have broken out in Genoa, one of the leaders being Giuseppe Garibaldi, a native of Nice (*b.* 1807). But Garibaldi, finding himself alone at the moment agreed upon, was obliged to flee, and was sentenced to death in contumacy with other comrades. The same sentence was passed on Mazzini during the trials of 1833.

Mazzini did not desist from his activities; he even enlarged their scope, accentuating their international character by the foundation of *Giovine Europa* in Berne (1834), a society divided into as many sections as there were nationalities among its members. This was the affirmation of an ideal rather than a positive form of political activity; however, the European governments, especially the French, brought such pressure to bear on the Swiss government that Mazzini was obliged to leave Switzerland and take refuge in England (1837), interrupting his revolutionary work for some years.

Even in Lombardy *Giovine Italia* had found adepts. The police, getting wind of Mazzini's propaganda, made a number of arrests (1833); the trial concluded in September 1835, with nineteen sentences of death, all of which were commuted. In March of this year Francis I died and was succeeded by Ferdinand I (1735-1848), a feeble-minded ruler, and an amnesty liberated all the political prisoners, some of whom, however, were deported. In 1839 the new Emperor came to Milan to don the iron crown (6 September), when he was welcomed with great festivities, followed by another amnesty. But the steps taken then and later against the excessive centralization of the government led to no useful result, and the brief idyll was soon over. While there was a party of high officials, nobles, and high ecclesiastics which took the side of Austria out of interest, and for the sake of a quiet life, the middle classes were from now onwards hostile to Austria and nationalist in sympathy.

About 1840 Mazzini resumed his work in connection with *Giovine Italia* in London, with a centre for organization and propaganda in Paris. Romagna offered a propitious soil on which the revolutionaries could begin to reorganize themselves and to agitate against Austria. In 1843 they attempted an insurrection in Bologna, which was followed by a long series of sentences and seven executions (1849). There was another outbreak in Rimini in 1845; the insurgents demanded the application of a programme of reforms, but the only result was the usual series of trials. Now the prisons of San Leo and Civitacastellana and the Carceri Nuove in Rome were full of political prisoners, and in Romagna the hatred of the Papal government had become general.

In Naples Ferdinand II (1830-1859) had ascended the throne, after his father's brief reign, at the age of twenty. He was gifted with unusual personal and political talents. The ruler of the largest State, the head of the strongest army in Italy, and in no way compromised by the perjury and reaction of 1820 and the following years, many set their hopes on him, and on his entry into Naples he was greeted with shouts of "Long live the King of Italy!" But his mentality, debased by that side of his nature which was akin to the Neapolitan *lazzarone*, and cramped by a superstitious and bigoted piety, was incapable of rising to the height of such an ideal. On the other hand,

he intended to rule as an absolute monarch, though he was jealous of his independence and inclined to favour administrative improvements. In 1832 the Carbonari, in their disappointment, entered into two conspiracies: one to assassinate the king, the other merely to proclaim the Constitution. Both were discovered and punished, but not at all severely; so that it was said that the Liberals of Bologna, admiring the king's moderation, sent him a message offering him the crown of Italy; an offer which the king was supposed to have refused "because he didn't know what to do with the Pope." And certainly the Papal dominion was an immediate obstacle to any aggrandizement of the kingdom of Naples; an obstacle which did not stand in the way of Piedmont.

There were regular insurrections at Penne in the Abruzzi and at Cosenza, in 1837, and at Aquila in 1841, and these were now followed by executions. Far more serious were the Sicilian risings of 1837, in Messina, Syracuse and Catania, caused by the persuasion that the cholera, which was devastating the island, was spread by poisonous powders distributed by the government. However, there were also constitutionalists and autonomists at work in the movement, which was repressed with inhuman severity by the Minister of Police, Del Carretto. From this time onwards the breach between the Bourbons and Sicily grew wider and wider. Meanwhile "Young Italy" and other secret societies were taking root in Sicily; among those who took part in their activities were Benedetto Musolino, Luigi Settembrini, and Giuseppe Massari; but the generality of the Neapolitan Liberals were not interested in Mazzini's programme. But there was a constitutional committee in Naples, with Carlo Poerio at its head, which kept in touch with the Mazzinists.

A general rising throughout Sicily and Calabria was planned for March 1844, but the only outbreak was at Cosenza, and this was easily repressed. When all was over there disembarked in Calabria, near Cotrone, on the 16 June, the Mazzinists Attilio and Emilio Bandiera, sons of the Austrian admiral (§ 109), and deserters from the Austrian navy, together with Domenico Moro of Venice, Nicolò Ricciotti of Frosinone, Domenico Lupatelli of Perugia, and a few more. Mazzini had sought in vain to hold them back; they were per-

suauded that an example was needed to awaken the Italians. After wandering at a venture for some days they were surprised and taken prisoner by the royal troops; and it was said that they had been betrayed by one of their party, the Corsican Boccheciampi. On the 25 July 1844, in the valley of Rovito, where on the 11 July five of those who were involved in the rising at Cosenza had been shot, the brothers Bandiera, with seven of their comrades, faced the firing party, shouting as they fell: "Viva d'Italia, viva la libertà, viva la patria!" Their death made a great impression, and it may perhaps have served the cause of Italy.

Even though their immediate results were inappreciable, the efforts of Mazzini were of great importance as propaganda; they did actually help to form the national consciousness, and they awakened European opinion to the fact that there was an Italian problem; if only because attention was drawn to it by the insurrections and the subsequent sentences.

§ III. THE MODERATE PARTY. ITALIAN CULTURE OF THE RISORGIMENTO.—It will be understood, however, that the repeated failure of insurrectionary movements, and the calm consideration of the state of affairs, of the actual ratio between the forces in opposition, led many to the conclusion that a different course must be followed. The Italian patriots were beginning to think that Italy could not of herself make *tabula rasa* of the world as it was, but that they must depend on the elements of progress which existed in that world in order to build the new Italy. And so the revolutionary movement was followed by the reformist movement. This was promoted and interpreted by a phalanx of writers—historians, scholars and philosophers.

Their first work, and in a sense the evangel of reformism, was the *Primato morale e civile degli italiani* (1843), by Vincenzo Gioberti (§ 110). From the ideals of Mazzini Gioberti had evolved in the direction of ideals of a much more temperate quality; he declared, in this work, that a pre-eminent position in the world was awaiting Italy, and a mission of guidance, deriving from the peculiar genius of her people, and her past, and above all from her bond with Papal

Rome, which ought to devote itself to exercising a function of leadership in Europe. To achieve her world mission Italy must undergo a political revival, must make herself independent, by forming a confederation of her princes with the Pope at their head. The starting-point of this confederation would be the union of Rome and Piedmont. Such were the beginnings of the school of the Neo-Guelfs, so called because they wished to make Italy respect the temporal power of the Papacy, and for salvation they looked to the Pope in his aspect of Italian sovereign.

Cesare Balbo also, in his *Speranze d'Italia* (1843), issued shortly after the *Primato*, was in favour of federation with the Pope. But for him the leading part in the restoration of Italy was reserved for the House of Savoy. The first thing to be done was to achieve independence, and this he expected would result not from a war, but from the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire, which would draw Austria eastwards. Another important publication was D'Azeglio's little work, *Degli ultimi casi di Romagna* (1846), which appeared after the rising in Rimini (§ 110). In this, although he denounced the Papal misgovernment, he censured the insurrectionary movements and expounded the programme of a reformist movement. In this way there was constituted what was known as the moderate party, which sought to achieve the independence and liberty of Italy by legal means, relying on the existing states, or at least on some of them.

The better to understand the efficacy of the work of these Italian publicists we must consider it within the general frame of the Italian literature of the first half of the century, almost all of which was of a patriotic nature, or at all events of a moral and civic character; that is, it was calculated to awaken and educate the conscience. This explains the efficacy of the European romantic movement, which had its birth in Germany in the Napoleonic period; a movement which was a complex of artistic tendencies, manifesting themselves not only in the sphere of literature, but also in that of the plastic arts and of music, and which consisted essentially in a breaking away from classic models, and in general from all conventional standards, in order to achieve a freer and more intimate expression of individual sentiment. The Romantics were therefore opposed to the imitation of the classics,

the rules of unity of place and time in tragedy, and in general the too rigid classification into literary categories, the abuse of mythology, and of subjects derived from antiquity; they wanted literature to be a more direct reflection of life, and since the contemporary world was Christian and not pagan, they looked, for their source of inspiration, to Christianity, and to the Middle Ages, the Christian epoch *par excellence*; and they marked a reaction against the rationalistic thinkers of the 18th century. They countered the exclusive admiration of the classic authors by pointing to the magnificent originality of certain modern writers, such as Shakespeare, Calderon, etc. In France, the country geographically and spiritually nearest to Italy, the Romantic movement assumed an extraordinary importance, influencing both historical and political literature.

In Italy the manifesto of the Romantic school was the *Lettera semiseria di Grisostomo* (1816) of Berchet (1783-1851), and his short-lived periodical, *Il Conciliatore* (§ 106). But the *Inni Sacri* had been published even before this, soon to be followed by *Il Cinque maggio*, the tragedies *Adelchi* and *Il Conte di Carmagnola*, and the romance, *I Promessi Sposi*. In Alessandro Manzoni (1785-1873), who wrote some shrewd disquisitions upon romantic theory, Italian Romanticism found its noblest expression; but his was a Romanticism which may well be called classic in its equilibrium and its formal perfection, though it is at the same time supremely modern in the realism, suffused with a delicate irony, which predominates in his masterpiece, *I Promessi Sposi*.

Already, in the case of Manzoni, the author of the ode *Marzo* 1821, and even more in that of the other writers of the Romantic School in Italy, literature had become an expression of patriotism. Lyrical poems inspired by all the passion of the Risorgimento, which for the patriots were hymns of battle, were written by Berchet, known as the Tyrtæus of Italy; and ranking next to him is Gabriele Rossetti (1783-1854), an exile of the Neapolitan revolution of 1820. A writer in the same tradition on the eve of 1848 was Goffredo Mameli (1827-1849), who gave his life in the defence of Rome, the author of the famous hymn *Fratelli d'Italia*; and later still there was Luigi Mercantini (1821-1872), author of the Garibaldian hymn *Si scopron le tombe, si*

*levano i morti*. More truly and intimately a poet was Giovanni Prati (1815-1884)—who embarked many years before 1848 on what was to be a long career, which made him the leader of the movement known as the "Second Romanticism"—but he too was steeped in national sentiment. A writer more concerned with "pure" art and the classic style was Luigi Carrer (1801-1850). The satires of Giuseppe Giusti (1809-1850), which were circulated in manuscript and eagerly sought after, were entirely political and patriotic; though at times there sounded through the satire a high lyrical note of human passion (*Sant' Ambrogio*). A writer whose work, although he was not affiliated to the patriotic movement, yet had some affinity with it, was Giacchino Belli (1791-1863), an excellent Roman poet, known for his satires on Papal Rome. The patriotic note was sounded in the theatre by Silvio Pellico's *Francesca da Rimini*, written before his imprisonment; and a wholly national muse (of the Ghibelline school) was that of Giambattista Niccolini (1782-1861), who deserted classic tragedy for romantic drama (*Giovanni da Procida*, *Arnaldo da Brescia*), though he never departed from the classic forms. The historical romance, influenced by the example of Manzoni (and Sir Walter Scott) took on a prevalently artistic or artistic and moral colouring in the *Marco Visconti* of Tommaso Grossi and the *Margherita Pusterla* of Cesare Cantù (see later), but even here the choice of historical material was dictated by national or romantic motives. Massimo d'Azeglio (1798-1866), on the other hand, devoted himself to evoking the past glories and misfortunes of his country in *Ettore Fieramosca* and *Niccolò di Lapi*, as did the fertile but turbid writer Francesco Domenico Guerrazzi (1804-1873), one of the democratic leaders of 1848, in his *Assedio di Firenze*.

The revival of historical studies contributed very effectively to rouse and stimulate the national consciousness. Cesare Cantù (1804-1895), the author of an extremely successful *Storia universale* (1st edition of 1838-1846), was a fertile worker in this domain; but rather than to him—who devoted himself mainly to vast compilations, and whose mentality was on the whole rather superficial and reactionary—the intellectual revival was due to men like Carlo Troya (1784-1858), a great collector of mediaeval documents, known for his

valuable researches into the history of the Middle Ages (*Del Veltro allegorico di Dante*), and Cesare Balbo (1789–1853), whom we have already mentioned; the author, amongst other works, of a *Sommario della storia d'Italia* (1846), inspired throughout by the ideal of national independence. A born historian was the Sicilian patriot and exile Michele Amari (1806–1889), who in his *Storia del Vespro siciliano* (1842) indicated the part played by the people in that famous rising. Later he wrote a *Storia dei Mussulmani di Sicilia* (1854–1872), which down to this day is a work of fundamental value. The passion for historical research and discussion—which served at the same time to refine and liberate the mind and awaken the national consciousness—was nourished by such collective organs as the “Deputazione di Storia patria,” founded in Turin by Charles Albert, and still more by the *Archivio storico italiano*, founded in Florence (1842) by a private individual, a sincere Liberal, who did much for the cause of historical research: Giampietro Vieusseux (1779–1863). Before this he had founded and edited (1821–1833) the *Antologia*, a literary review of the English type, which until it was suppressed by the Tuscan government was a focus of the new liberal and national culture. Among his principal contributors was the Florentine writer and historian Gino Capponi (1792–1876).

Unconnected with this historical movement, but important as appealing to the national consciousness, were two writers of the classic school: Carlo Botta (1766–1837), whose *Storia d'Italia dal 1789 al 1814* is deserving of special mention, and Pietro Colletta (1775–1891), whose *Storia del reame di Napoli* was a manifesto against the Bourbons.

An active contributor to the *Antologia*, and a friend of Vieusseux and Capponi, was the Dalmatian Nicolò Tommasso (1802–1834), who lived for many years in exile; a most fertile writer on many subjects, and on national questions amongst others, he wrote lyrics and romances, and was also a profound student of the Italian language. Even his philosophical studies, which are marked by the reaction of the purist in the direction of 18th-century Gallicism, had a certain national value. Other champions of “purism” were Antonio Cesari (1760–1828) and Basilio Puoti; the school which the latter kept in Naples (1825–1847) was a nursery of noble spirits, among whom



we shall find Francesco De Sanctis. Pietro Giordano (1774-1848), the author of many essays, and a copious and lively correspondent, deliberately encouraged national and liberal thinkers to study languages and the tenets of "purism."

Holding aloof from the literary patriots of his time—a solitary giant, whose stature hardly anyone then realized—was Giacomo Leopardi (1798-1837). He too began by sounding the patriotic note (the canzone *All'Italia*), but he soon abandoned it, expressing his inconsolable pessimism in the *Canti*, poems of unsurpassed and unsurpassable perfection. Nourished on the classics, his work none the less expresses a depth and intimacy of feeling unusual in Italian poetry, and which might be described as romantic, but he had no connection with either of the schools, nor with contemporary poets, although he was the greatest of them all. In his *Operette morali* he expressed his moral and philosophical ideas in more logical form, but he made no secret of his scepticism in respect of the liberal movements, and he deplored the departure from the rationalism of the 18th century, while he preached the brotherhood of man as against the hostility of Nature.

Italian philosophy, at this period, was following a very different direction from that of Leopardi's thought. In the first half of the 19th century there was a philosophical revival; writers worthy of mention were Pasquale Galluppi (1770-1835), Antonio Rosmini Serbati, (1797-1833), Vincenzo Gioberti (1801-1852), and Terenzio Mamiani (1799-1885), another exiled patriot. The new philosophy, emerging from the sensualism of the 18th century and assimilating in some degree the critical method and the idealism of the Germans (from Kant to Hegel), elaborated novel gnoseological and metaphysical theories (the ideological psychologism of Rosmini, the ontologism of Gioberti). A characteristic of this new Italian philosophy was the tendency (analogous to Neo-Guelfism in the political domain) to reconcile philosophical thought with the dogmas of the Church. Gioberti, however, in writings which were not published during his lifetime, evolved in the direction of a conception which was entirely free from dogma.

Of much less importance, whether in the aesthetic or in the politico-social domain, was the art of the Risorgimento. During the Napoleonic

period neo-classicism had been predominant—and it was, of course, well adapted to the political climate—as in the sculpture of Antonio Canova (§ 101), whose fame and influence were European, and in the paintings of Andrea Appiani (1754–1817). During the Restoration it continued to predominate in the form of a cold, academic art; of this the leading representatives were—in painting—Vincenzo Camuccini (1775–1844), Pietro Benvenuti (1769–1844) and Luigi Sabatelli (1772–1850); in sculpture, the Romanized Dane, Albert Thorvaldsen (1770–1844), and his pupil Pietro Tenerani (1789–1869). The academic school was vigorously attacked in the second quarter of the century by the sculptor Lorenzo Bartolini (1777–1850), who preached a return to the truth, though he himself took liberties with it; and the same may be said of two other sculptors, Carlo Marocchetti (1805–1868) and Vincenzo Vela (1822–1891), who, starting where Marocchetti left off, was yet his inferior. Giovanni Duprè (1817–1882) also derived from Marocchetti, but was a much more original artist than Vela. These two sculptors continued their activities well into the second half of the century.—In painting Francesco Hayez (1791–1882) replaced the academic style of neo-classicism by a sentimental and mannered romanticism; and beside him, though greatly his inferior, we must mention Massimo d’Azeglio, a landscape painter whose anti-academic intentions were imperfectly realized. The romantic school of painting showed a predilection for the historical picture, corresponding to the historical novel in the domain of literature. Generally speaking, the Italian art of the Risorgimento was mediocre, and it was unrelated to the developments which were taking place elsewhere in Europe, and especially in France.

Of much greater importance was the Italian music of this period, though only in the domain of opera. The Italian *opera buffa* reached its apogee at the beginning of the Restoration (1816), with the “Barber of Seville” of Gioacchino Rossini (1792–1868). Serious opera, during the Napoleonic period, was produced more especially in France, but by Italian composers, such as Luigi Cherubini (1760–1892) and Gaspare Spontini (1773–1851), in whose hands it assumed a richer and more elaborate form. A serious opera which surpassed all its predecessors was the “William Tell” (*Guglielmo Tell*, 1829) of Rossini,

which was his last work. During the romantic period operatic melody (the *aria*) enjoyed a revival in the music-dramas of Vincenzo Bellini (1801–1835: *La Sonnambula*, *Norma*) and Gaetano Donizetti (1798–1848: *La Favorita*, *Lucia di Lammermoor*) who was also the composer of two delicious comic operas, *Elixir d'amore* and *Don Pasquale*. Even before the mid-century Giuseppe Verdi (1813–1901) had made a great impression. His was to be a long career (*Nabucco*, *Il Trovatore*, *La Traviata*, *Rigoletto*, etc.), and we shall have occasion to speak of him again.

§ 112. CHARLES ALBERT AND PIUS IX. THE REFORMS.—In order to pass from theory to reality the political and reformist movement had need of at least one of the Italian sovereigns. The moderate party, which, as we have seen, was composed very largely of Piedmontese, directed their gaze upon Charles Albert, who seemed, as a ruler, to be on the verge of a new orientation.

Since 1835 Charles Albert's minister for foreign affairs—that is, the man who held what was by tradition the most important post in the government—had been Count Solaro della Margherita, a type of the perfect absolutist. Notable civil reforms had been introduced, such as the abolition of feudal jurisdiction in Sardinia, and the promulgation of the Civil Code (1837)—which resembled the Code Napoléon, and had the great merit of abolishing the multiplicity and confusion of existing laws, and establishing the civil equality of all citizens—and the Penal Code (1839), which established the equality of all citizens before the law and mitigated the penalties of the law. Reforms of penal procedure followed, and a convention with the Holy See (1841), by which ecclesiastics were made to some extent amenable to the criminal jurisdiction of the State. All this, however, was no more than a resumption of the work of the enlightened absolutism of the 18th century, and such reforms had still to catch up with the Napoleonic regime.

In 1842 the marriage of the Crown Prince Victor Emmanuel, Duke of Savoy, with Marie Adelaide of Habsburg-Lorraine, daughter of the Archduke Rainer, Viceroy of Lombardy-Venetia, seemed to confirm the understanding with Austria; and yet there is good reason for

asserting that the reserved and diffident monarch had always cherished the idea of a war with Austria and an independent Italy. Other facts, moreover, went to show that Charles Albert was adopting a new policy. In 1842 he gave his permission for the foundation of an agrarian society for the whole of Piedmont, thereby breaking with the absolutist tradition which opposed anything that might afford the citizens opportunities of assembling and understanding one another; and the association did actually become a centre of political life. In 1844 he permitted and encouraged the institution of infant asylums and training colleges, which lessened the absolute preponderance of the Jesuits in the domain of education. He also struck a medal to be awarded to those who sent him copies of their works as an act of homage, on which the lion of Savoy was represented as plucking an eagle, while on the obverse were effigies of Dante, Columbus, Raphael and Galileo, encircled by the motto which had formerly been that of Amedeus VI, *j'atans (attends) mon astre*. New men, less reactionary, were called to office or given educational posts. Predari founded *L'Antologia Italiana*, to which Balbo, Gioberti, D'Azeglio and Farini were contributors. To D'Azeglio, on his return from Romagna at the end of 1845, the king said: "Make these gentlemen understand that they must keep quiet and mark time; there is nothing to be done for the moment; but let them be assured that when the opportunity presents itself my life, the life of my sons, my weapons, my fortune, my army, will all be lavished in the cause of Italy." At the beginning of 1846 there was a diplomatic dispute with Austria in respect of the customs, which was brought to the notice of the public in a drastic article which was published in the semi-official *Gazzetta Piemontese*; and on this occasion Charles Albert exclaimed, in the Cabinet: "If we lose Austria we shall find Italy, and then Italy will go her own way."

However, the Italian sovereign who gave the effective impulse to the reformist movement was not the Savoyard monarch, but the new pontiff. On the 1 June 1846 Gregory XVI died. The Conclave, assembling on the 14th, was divided substantially into two parties, for and against Lambruschini, the ex-Secretary of State; but in the end (16 June) Giovanni Mastai-Ferretti of Sinigaglia was elected, taking the name of Pius IX (1846-1878). The new Pope, when he ascended

the throne, had a certain reputation as a Liberal; as Bishop of Spoleto, and then of Imola, he had been mild and conciliatory, and he was among those who were opposed to Pope Gregory's policy. He was no pro-Austrian, but a sincere lover of Italy. He had read the *Primato*, and was not ill-pleased with the mission which that work allotted to the Papacy. He was a man of only moderate intelligence, capable of generous actions, but also of extreme obstinacy, and his impulsive temperament was in some degree explained by the epilepsy which had tormented him from the days of his youth. A factor which increased his popularity was the unfounded rumour that Austria had commissioned Cardinal Gaysruck, Archbishop of Milan, to veto his election (§ 92) but he arrived when the Conclave was already sitting.

On the 16 July the new Pope granted a political amnesty, more inclusive than those which had been conceded on similar occasions by his predecessors; but it was not a general amnesty, and those who were liberated had to make a declaration of loyalty. However, coming at an opportune moment, it aroused great enthusiasm; the public looked upon Pius IX as the hoped-for liberator; he was acclaimed by all Italy, and the demonstrations in his favour gave the Liberals a chance of asserting themselves; in the Papal State newspapers were issued, pamphlets were published, and political clubs were founded; in short, there was a period of intense and general excitement.

Certain actions of the new pontiff's inaugurated the period of the reforms which had been so long desired; in March 1847 he published a law relating to the Press which was comparatively liberal (the censorship was entrusted to a commission most of whose members were laymen); in April he promised a State Consulta; in June he constituted a Cabinet; on the 5 July he published a decree relating to the constitution of the Civic Guard. His example was beginning to affect the other Italian sovereigns; Leopold II, in May, granted relative liberty to the Press, and in September he founded the civic guard; in the Duchy of Lucca, where Charles Louis was asked to grant the Constitution, he escaped from the impasse by ceding the State to Leopold II (to whom it would have reverted on the death of the Duchess of Parma); in Piedmont Charles Albert disbanded the Margherita regiment and promulgated a series of important

administrative reforms (October 1846), while a customs union was negotiated between Rome, Florence and Turin.

In Lombardy-Venetia there were national and anti-Austrian demonstrations on the pretext (amongst others) of doing honour to Pius IX; Austria began to take her precautions, and on the 13 August she occupied Ferrara. This greatly excited the Liberals, and provoked a protest from the Pope, so that in December Austria withdrew her troops to the fortress, where by the Treaty of Vienna she was allowed to station a garrison; but in the same month the Austrians occupied Parma, where, Marie Louise having died in Vienna, Charles Louis succeeded to the throne. Henceforth a war with Austria seemed possible and even probable, in view of the unrest in Germany, and in the Austrian Empire itself.

On the 3 January 1848 there were riots in Milan, and conflicts with the police, resulting from the anti-Austrian demonstration of the Liberals, which took the form of abstaining from tobacco. In Palermo, on the 12 January, an actual insurrection against the Bourbons broke out; within a few days the royal forces were compelled to evacuate the whole of Sicily, excepting the citadel of Messina, and the Spanish Constitution of 1812 was proclaimed. Moved thereto, perhaps, by the Sicilian insurrection, King Ferdinand became a reformist, and at one blow he overcame his opponents by announcing (29 January) a Constitution, which he promulgated on the 10 February. On the 8 February Charles Albert promised the Statute which he promulgated on the 4 March; on the 16th Cesare Balbo formed the first constitutional ministry. The Grand Duke of Tuscany, however, conceded the Constitution on the 11 February and published it on the 17th; at last, on the 14 March, Pius IX did the same, but with special restrictions imposed by the necessities of the theocratic government. In these Italian constitutions, modelled on the French Constitution of 1830, there were two chambers, of which one, the Senate, was appointed by the sovereign; the other was elected on a rather restricted suffrage. The constitutions provided for ministerial responsibility, irresponsibility of the sovereign, civil liberty and equality, liberty of the Press, and a civic guard.

§ 113. THE REVOLUTION OF 1848 AND THE WAR WITH AUSTRIA.—Hitherto the Italian movement had been autochthonous in character; it had attracted the attention and sympathy of the outer world and increased the prestige of the Italian nation. There remained the one great obstacle; Austria not only barred the way to national independence, but rendered the work of reform uncertain and dangerous. The Italians would hardly have gone so far as to attack Austria of their own accord. What settled the matter was a European revolution, which began in France.

The monarchy of Louis Philippe (§ 109) had persistently disappointed the hopes of the progressive elements, and had ended by lapsing into absolute Conservatism. In addition to the republican opposition, which after the unsuccessful revolts of the early years of the monarchy had continued its work by legal methods, there was a party of Liberal Constitutionalists. Bonapartism, through the pretender, Louis Napoleon, the son of Napoleon's brother Louis, had on two occasions vainly attempted a *coup de main*; and lastly, there had arisen the Socialist or Communist party, which aimed at the redemption of the proletariat, with the right to work and the establishment of economic as well as political equality. All the opposition parties demanded universal suffrage, or at least a wide extension of electoral rights. An insurrection broke out in Paris on the 22 February 1848, after a vain attempt to form a new monarchical government with members of the opposition, leading on the 24th to the abdication and flight of Louis Philippe, and on the 25th to the proclamation of the Republic. The flame spread; on the 13 March there was a revolution in Vienna; Metternich resigned; the liberty of the Press, the civic guard, and the convocation of a Constituent Assembly were conceded. In Prussia also, and in the rest of Germany, revolutionary movements forced the sovereigns' hands, and a Constituent Assembly was convoked in Frankfort, whose task was the reorganization of Germany.

On the 17 March the news of the Viennese insurrection was received in Milan, and on the morning of the 18th the Imperial edict was posted up, permitting the convocation of the Estates of the Empire and the liberty of the Press (but not conceding the National Guard promised

in Vienna). An enormous throng, led by Cesare Correnti, Enrico Cernuschi and other notable citizens, induced the *podestà*, Gabrio Casati, to place himself at its head—which he did with some reluctance—and proceeded to the palace of the vice-governor O'Donnell, who immediately conceded the dissolution of the police and the formation of a civic guard. But an affray between a squad of soldiers and the crowd turned the demonstration into a revolt, which rapidly extended throughout the city, Carlo Cattaneo being foremost among its leaders. Thereupon Marshal Radetzky, after six hours' desperate resistance, occupied the Broletto (the municipal palace), arresting there more than a hundred persons, who were confined in the Castello as hostages. During the night, however, hundreds of barricades were thrown up, and in the morning a few hundred citizens, armed with rifles, manned them and held the Austrians in check, being assisted by women and boys, who rained tiles, stones, and boiling oil upon the troops, while the bells sounded the tocsin as though in reply to the thunder of the Austrian cannonade.

Radetzky's troops, although increased by reinforcements to a strength of some twenty thousand, were beginning to lose ground. On the 20th they abandoned the cathedral; on the 22nd they held only the Castello and the walls. But on the same day the bastions and the gates were occupied, with the help of volunteers from the neighbouring cities, who attacked them from without. There was a desperate struggle at Porta Tosa, where Luciano Manara distinguished himself; and thenceforth—officially after 1859—it was known as Porta Vittoria. At last Radetzky abandoned the Castello and retreated through Lombardy to the fortresses of the Quadrilateral (Mantua, Verona, Peschiera, Legnago).

Meanwhile, at the news of the revolution in Vienna, Venice had risen. The mob obtained the release of Nicolò Tommaso and of Daniele Manin, a distinguished advocate and Venetian patriot, arrested some days earlier. On the 18th Manin organized the civic guard; on the 22nd he occupied the Arsenal without encountering resistance. In the evening the Austrian garrison withdrew. The provisional government, with Manin at its head, proclaimed the Republic. From Milan and Venice the insurrection spread to the whole of Lombardo-Venetia,



so that the Austrians held nothing but the Quadrilateral: a small territory, but a formidable strategic position.

The duchies, evacuated by the Austrian troops, rebelled, compelling Charles Louis and Francis V to vacate their capitals. Bodies of volunteers were formed throughout Italy, and first of all in Lombardo-Venetia itself; the bersaglieri of Manara, the "Crusaders" from various cities, Canozzi's column from Bergamo, and a body of Udinese under Zucchi (§ 109), who had been released from prison. In Piedmont the emotional tension and the warlike impatience of the republicans reached their culmination at the news of events in Milan, and overcame the last hesitating doubts of Charles Albert, to whom the insurgents had already sent a message. On the 23 March the king published a proclamation to the people of Lombardy and Venetia, announcing that his armies were coming to lend them "the aid which brother expects from brother, friend from friend," and that he trusted in that God "Who has given Italy Pius IX," and that he would "enable Italy to become independent." As a demonstration of the sentiment of Italian unity his troops would bear the arms of Savoy superimposed on the tricolour. On the 25th the Piedmontese army began to cross the Ticino; it was the 10 April before it crossed the Mincio, after successful encounters with the Austrian rearguard at Goito, Monzambano and Valeggio.

On the 7 April Mazzini, returning from exile, entered Milan, and in order not to disturb the harmony of the assembled forces he abstained from republican propaganda.

In Tuscany, under the pressure of the popular enthusiasm, the governor declared war and sent a few regular troops into Lombardy, accompanied by a larger force of volunteers, especially university students. In the Papal State the ministry began to enrol volunteers, and constituted a regular active service corps in Bologna under Giovanni Durando; but while for the people, and for Durando himself, any pretext would serve for a war against Austria, Pius IX proposed to remain on the defensive, and the ministry, under the presidency of Cardinal Antonelli, did not know what to be at. Durando, however, crossed the frontier; but thereupon the pontiff, preoccupied with his position as head of the Church, and with the movement of protest

against his attitude which was beginning to diffuse itself in the Roman Catholic world, and which was not untouched by anti-Roman separatism, declared explicitly, in his allocation in Consistory on the 29 April, that he did not intend to take part in the war, as it was his duty to embrace "all the races, peoples and nations with a like solicitude of paternal love." Thus the equivocal nature of the neo-Guelf movement was beginning to declare itself; and a breach occurred in the coherence of the national movement. However, the effect of the allocation was weakened for the time being by a proclamation dated 1 May, in which the pontiff declared that he was incapable of restraining the national ardour of one section of his subjects. A new ministry, formed by Mamiani, took the precaution of placing the regular and volunteer forces under the protection of Charles Albert, in order to assure them of the quality of belligerents.

Ferdinand II of Naples had sent troops into Upper Italy under Guglielmo Pepe, but after the 15 May (§ 114) he recalled them, and only a small minority under Pepe himself reached Venice.

As a matter of fact, the reinforcement which these various bodies of regulars and volunteers afforded Charles Albert was inconsiderable; at the same time, the Piedmontese command showed itself in no hurry to utilize and stimulate the mustering of volunteers (amidst whom was a corps commanded by Garibaldi, who had returned from South America, where he had distinguished himself in fighting for various American republics). Nor was Charles Albert able to advance operations with the necessary speed, so that Radetzky had time to recover himself and obtain reinforcements. He still enjoyed the support even of liberal Austria; the Germanic revolutionaries did not fraternize with other peoples, and it was largely to the clash of the various national movements (German, Hungarian, Slav) that the Habsburg dynasty owed its salvation. After crossing the Mincio the king had invested Peschiera, but nearly three weeks were passed in complete inactivity; not until the 30 April were the Austrians driven out of Pastrengo by a brilliantly fought engagement, and Peschiera was thus separated from Verona. An attack in the direction of Verona, at Santa Lucia, was not pushed home, and nothing was gained by it (6 May). General Nugent, bringing reinforcements to Radetzky, repulsed a

body of Venetian and Roman troops at Cornuda (9 May), and by a feigned attack on Vicenza he cleared the way to Verona, which he reached on the 22nd. Then, boldly marching out from Verona, he moved in the direction of Peschiera, attacking at Cartatone and Montemara the extreme right wing of the Piedmontese, which consisted of five thousand Tuscans. These, assailed by thirty-five thousand Austrians, held out for six hours (29 May). After taking Cartatone, on the following day the Austrians encountered the main army of Charles Albert, which had succeeded in concentrating at Goito, and were defeated. That same evening the news reached the camp of the surrender of Peschiera, which the relieving forces had not reached, and the troops acclaimed Charles Albert King of Italy.

And it did actually seem that Charles Albert was on the way to becoming at least King of Upper Italy. On the 29 May a plebiscite (which was contrary to the promises made that any political settlement would be postponed until victory was achieved) voted for the union with Piedmont of Lombardy, Parma, Piacenza and Modena; on the 4th June the same wish was expressed by the Venetian provinces, and at last even by Venice (3 July), notwithstanding the opposition of Manin. But the progress of the war did not correspond with these wishes. Radetzky, who was not attacked by the Piedmontese after Coito, invested Vicenza in order to assure his retreat into the Tyrol in case of need, and Durando, whose forces were outnumbered by two to one, was obliged to capitulate (11 June). Even before this, by taking Pieve di Cadore (5 June), other Austrian forces had reconquered Cadore, notwithstanding the valiant defence of Pietro Fortunato Calvi; so that the whole of the Venetian mainland was lost. The inaction of the royal army, which was due to the irresolution of its commanders, and also to the difficulty of attacking Radetzky in the Quadrilateral, was giving rise to unjust accusations of treachery against Charles Albert.

Certainly, the king, welcoming the idea of negotiations with Austria—in which Lord Palmerston acted as intermediary, while Pius IX also made his contribution, sending Cardinal Morichini to the Emperor in May, to invite him, in the name of the principle of nationality, to evacuate Italy—was inclined to content himself with the line

of the Adige. The Balbo ministry, and the Casati ministry which followed it, would not hear of such a thing. On the resumption of the campaign Radetzky, who had received further reinforcements from Austria, where internal conditions had improved, moved out from Verona to attack the Piedmontese army. After three days' fighting (23-25 July) the Piedmontese, notwithstanding some partial successes, and in spite of the valour with which they fought, were thrown back from the heights of Custoza and compelled to retire upon Goito.

After the Austrians had occupied Volta Charles Albert, for political reasons, committed the final error of retiring, in the direction of Milan, to a position which was completely exposed. Being immediately overtaken by Radetzky, he was forced to capitulate, undertaking to recross the Ticino (5 August). The Milanese, who had been informed that they were to resist the enemy, believed that they had been betrayed. They attacked the king in the Palazzo Greppi, where he was grazed by a bullet; at night he succeeded in escaping from the city, followed by the army. The frontier recrossed, on the 9 August General Salasco signed an armistice by which Piedmont pledged herself to abandon the Duchies and Venice. The Lombardo-Venetian volunteers disbanded. Giuseppe Garibaldi, with his volunteers, held out until the end of August in Comasco; then, after the encounter at Morazzone (26 August), he took refuge in Lugano.

The final consolidation of the Habsburg government in Vienna, after the city had submitted to armed force in October, went far to strengthen the Austrian position in Lombardy. The Croats, loyal to the dynasty, fought the Hungarian rebels. In December 1848 Ferdinand I abdicated; he was succeeded by his eighteen-year-old nephew, Francis Joseph (1848-1916).

§ 114. CRISIS AT HOME AND WAR ABROAD. NOVARA. THE SIEGES OF ROME AND OF VENICE. THE TRIUMPH OF AUSTRIA AND THE REACTION. — The internal situation of the various Italian states had not reached a condition of stable equilibrium. There were clashes between their moderates, democrats and republicans; their municipalists, federalists and unitarians. And under all the pure reactionaries were at work. In Naples the liberals wished to modify

the Constitution in a more democratic sense; one section of the deputies elected refused to take the oath to maintain the existing Constitution; and in the end, on the 14 May, the more advanced Liberals began to construct barricades. But on the following day the royal troops dispersed the rebels with much bloodshed; the army of Upper Italy was recalled and the Chamber dissolved, while new elections were held. The new Chamber, convoked in July, was soon prorogued. Sicily persisted in its separatist attitude, and offered the crown to Ferdinand Duke of Genoa, son of Charles Albert (11 July), who, however, did not accept it.

In Rome there was a conflict, and an incurable misunderstanding, between the Pope, who did not want war, and who meant to retain the supreme control of affairs, and the Liberals, who wanted war and a truly constitutional government. After the Mamiani ministry, which had convoked Parliament in June, and the Fabbri ministry which followed it, the Pope appeared to have found the minister he wanted in the economist and politician Pellegrini Rossi, a man of unusual energy, who had represented the Orléans monarchy in Rome. Rossi, considering that war with Austria was impossible, refused to sign the military convention required by Piedmont, and although he was anxious to enter into understandings with the other states he was opposed to an Italian confederation, as he was afraid of Piedmont. But on the 15 November he was stabbed on the stairs of the Palazzo della Cancelleria on his way to re-open Parliament. On the 16th there was a riotous demonstration in front of the Quirinal, which led to a conflict with the troops. The Pope found himself compelled to give office to two men of advanced ideas, Sterbini and Galletti; but on the 24th November he fled from Rome in disguise, taking refuge at Gaeta, where he appointed a governmental commission in place of the ministry, and prorogued Parliament.

Parliament, on the other hand, appointed a governmental *giunta*, which announced elections for a Constituent Assembly. The elections, declared void by Pius IX, produced a republican Assembly, which at one o'clock in the morning of the 9 February proclaimed the abolition of the theocratic government and the institution of the Roman Republic, moving that the Pope should be given all necessary guaran-

tees in respect of the independence of his spiritual supremacy. The Assembly elected from its own members an executive committee composed of Armellini, Saliceti and Montecchi.

Something of the same kind had happened in Tuscany. On the 27 October 1848 the democrats came into power with the Montanelli-Guerrazzi ministry, which was in favour of sending representatives to the Constituent Assembly in Rome, in order that this should become an Italian Assembly. At this the Grand Duke left Florence, embarking at Santo Stefano for Gaeta (21 February 1849). A provisional government was constituted, under a triumvirate consisting of Guerrazzi, Montanelli and Mazzoni.

In Piedmont, after a number of very short-lived and feeble governments had followed the Balbo ministry, Gioberti came into power (December 1848), supported by democratic agitators. However, he detached himself from the democratic party, his object being to establish a stronger government. He proposed an expedition to Tuscany, which was to restore the Grand Duke and keep Austria at bay; but he was deserted by his colleagues and by the king, and compelled to resign (February 1849). His colleagues, who remained in office—and among whom Urbano Rattazzi represented the tendency to the Left—decided to resume the war, and the armistice was denounced (12 March).

The military command, after certain generals of the royal army had been tried and found wanting, was conferred upon a foreigner, the Polish general Albert Chrzanowsky. Against the 120,000 Piedmontese, composed largely of new recruits and undisciplined volunteers, with officers who were mainly opposed to the campaign, who were extended on a long front from Lago Maggiore to the Po, Radetzky brought up his army of 100,000 regulars, inured to war. Concentrating it near Pavia, on the 20 March he crossed the Ticino at La Cava, which General Ramorino, the revolutionary of 1834 (§ 110), in disobedience to orders received, had failed to occupy. On the morning of the 21st an Austrian corps was thrown back upon the Sforzesca, but in the afternoon another corps occupied Montara. On the 23 March 50,000 Piedmontese concentrated at Novara were attacked by the inferior forces of the Austrian com-

mander D'Aspre at La Bicocca, which was four times taken by them and lost again. The Dukes of Savoy and Genoa, having him at a disadvantage, prepared for the final attack, but were not supported by Chrzanowsky. Having received strong reinforcements, in the afternoon the Austrians repulsed the Piedmontese, and by the evening were in possession of the field.

King Charles Albert, who had sought death in vain, sued for an armistice; but in view of the dishonourable conditions demanded by Radetzky he abdicated that evening in favour of the Duke of Savoy, and on the following day he left Piedmont to take refuge in Portugal. He died in Oporto on the 28 July. The Duke of Savoy, now King Victor Emmanuel II, concluded the armistice at Vignale, by which he was obliged to pledge himself to reduce the army to a peace footing, dismiss the volunteers, and agree to the Austrian occupation of a portion of his territory until the conclusion of peace.

The immediate repercussion of Novara was felt in Tuscany, where the moderates, to prevent an Austrian intervention, overthrew Guerrazzi, who had been dictator since the 28 March, and constituted a governmental commission (Ricasoli, Capponi), which invited the Grand Duke to return to his states. But this did not stop D'Aspre, who had already occupied Lucca, and when the resistance offered by Leghorn had been overcome (10-11 May) he entered Florence (25 May).

After Novara King Ferdinand resolved to make an end of the Sicilian revolution. The Bourbon forces, which since September 1848 had retaken Messina, overcame the resistance of the Sicilians at Catania (April), and on the 11 May they compelled Palermo to surrender.

In Rome, where the republic was threatened, not only by the Austrian victory but by French intervention, a triumvirate consisting of Armellini, Saffi and Mazzini was appointed (29 March) with absolute powers. Pius IX, from Gaeta, had appealed to the Catholic powers, and Cardinal Antonelli, his minister, had proposed a collective occupation of the Papal State by Austria, Spain, Naples and France. The first three powers at once accepted the proposal; in France the Constituent Assembly was divided between hostility

to Austria—indeed the President of the Republic, Louis Napoleon, elected by universal suffrage in December 1848, had wished to make war upon Austria—and the desire to maintain the temporal power of the Papacy, a cause which appealed to the Catholics, who had great influence, and whose support Louis Napoleon himself needed for the achievement of his ambitions. At last, by an equivocal formula, the government was given permission to occupy certain points in Italy; and this decided the occupation of Civitavecchia, where an expeditionary corps under General Oudinot landed on 25 April 1849.

Volunteers had flocked to Rome from every part of Italy in defence of the republic; and foremost among them was the Italian Legion commanded by Giuseppe Garibaldi, who after the battle of Morazzone had gone to Liguria, and then into the Papal State, where he had organized a new volunteer corps. On the 30 April the French attacked the city on the side of the Janiculum, but were thrown back and defeated in a battle of which Garibaldi was principal hero. An armistice followed, with negotiations for peace, while a Neapolitan army advanced into Papal territory, only to be defeated by Garibaldi at Belletri (19 May). Meanwhile the Austrians took Bologna (16 May), and after twenty-seven days' resistance Ancona (10 June). On the 31 May the French diplomatist De Lesseps concluded with the republic a convention which Oudinot declared that he would not ratify, giving warning that on the 4 June he would resume operations against the fortified area. Then, unexpectedly, at dawn on the 3 June, Oudinot opened the attack upon the positions on the Janiculum, on the pretext that they lay outside the fortified area. Villa Corsini was occupied (4 June), though a desperate defence was made against a greatly superior enemy; but Villa del Vascello was not so easily captured; the assailants had to lay regular siege to the position and to bombard the city. At last, on the 29th, Medici was obliged to abandon Vascello, now in ruins; and on the 30th Villa Spada was occupied, when Luciano Manara and his Lombard volunteers were killed after a fight that was finished with knives. Resistance was no longer possible, and on the 4 July the French took possession of the city. Garibaldi, on the 2 July, with a party of volunteers, had begun a memorable retreat; evading the French and Austrian troops, he reached the territory of



San Marino, where he disbanded his legion, and after other vicissitudes (his wife Anita, whom he had married in South America, and who had been his comrade in his heroic adventures, died in the Pineta of Ravenna) he reached safety in Liguria.

Other cities where the Italian people offered a valiant resistance were Brescia and Venice. Brescia, which had revolted during the resumption of hostilities between Charles Albert and the Austrians, held out for ten days against the troops of Nugent and Haynau (23 March–1 April), when the latter general had to fight his way into the streets of the city, which after this desperate conflict was known as “the Lioness of Italy.” At the beginning of May it was the turn of Venice, and there the defence was inspired by the dictator (2 April) Manin. The fortress of Marghera on the mainland, a position of great importance, had to be abandoned after twenty-two days, when it had been reduced to a heap of ruins (4–26 May). However, Venice still held out, against the bombardment, against famine, against the cholera, until on the 23 August terms of surrender were subscribed. The garrison was allowed to march out under arms, and a complete amnesty was granted, except in the case of forty citizens who went into exile; among them Manin, Tommaseo and Guglielmo Pepe. Between Piedmont and Austria, on the basis of the armistice of Vignale, the Peace of Milan was concluded (6 August 1849), by the terms of which Piedmont undertook to pay an indemnity of 75 million lire. The peace treaty, submitted to Parliament, met with serious opposition in the recently elected Chamber of Deputies; whereupon the king, on the advice of the prime minister, Massimo d’Azeglio, decided to dissolve the Chamber, appealing to the people with the Proclamation of Moncalieri (20 November), in which he threatened a *coup d’état*. The new Chamber, on the 9 November 1850, approved the treaty.

## CHAPTER XIX

### *THE FORMATION OF THE UNITARY STATE*

§ 115. ITALY FROM 1849 TO 1859.—Italy, with the exception of Piedmont, had apparently reverted to the state of affairs which had existed before 1848. In 1849 Austria had defeated the Hungarian revolution, with the help of Russia, and in 1850, after the failure of the German revolution, she had completely re-established her hegemony in Germany, so that she seemed stronger than ever. But the new spirit that had arisen in Italy was not stifled; the indefatigable Mazzini resumed his propaganda, from Switzerland and then from London, while in Piedmont constitutional institutions were functioning, the tricolour was still flying, and the patriots who had settled there, in exile from various parts of Italy, constituted a centre of hope and national encouragement.

Lombardo-Venetia, after Novara, was placed under the dictatorship of Radetzky, the civil and military governor. Nevertheless, the revolutionary organization still survived, with the Italian National Committee at its head. This was in London; it consisted of Mazzini, Saffi, Montecchi, etc., and from the outset large powers were concentrated in its hands. Prosecutions and condemnations were fairly frequent, especially against those found in possession of anti-Austrian literature, or the certificates of the national loan issued by the London Committee for the purpose of amassing funds for the work of the revolution. It was the discovery of one of these certificates which gave rise to the prosecution in Mantua of Don Enrico Tazzoli, president of the Revolutionary Committee of Mantua, and other members of the Committee; the trials ended with nine executions (December 1852—March 1853) on the bastions of Belfiore (among the “martyrs of Belfiore” were Tazzoli, Tito Speri, the hero of the “ten days” of Brescia, and the archpriest Grazioli). An attempted

revolution in Milan, promoted by Mazzini, failed completely (6 February 1853); and an insurrectionary movement in Venetia, led by Pietro Fortunato Calvi (§ 113) was no more successful. Calvi was arrested and hanged in Mantua on the 9 July 1855.

In the Duchies, which were more than ever dependencies of Austria, the nuclei of Liberal or Mazzinist opposition still survived. In Parma Duke Charles III (1849–1854), who had succeeded his father Charles Louis, angered his subjects by the extravagances of his private life, and in 1859 he was the victim of a republican rising, which had no other consequences, as he was succeeded by his son Robert, a minor, under the regency of his mother, Louise Marie de Berry (sister of the Bourbon pretender to the throne of France, the Comte de Chambord). In Tuscany the Grand Duke Leopold II, owing to the intervention of the Austrians, who remained in the country until 1855, had completely alienated himself from the moderate elements, so that his throne had no solid foundation in the hearts of the people. The Constitution was suspended, and finally revoked (May 1852). A Concordat with the Holy See (April 1851) had marked the abandonment of the Leopoldine traditions.

Pio Nono had re-entered Rome on the 12 April 1850. Before this (September 1849) he had uttered from Portici a *motu proprio* in which he promised a State Consulta, provincial and communal councils, and reforms in the codes; but if these measures were inadequate their application was even more so. Louis Napoleon had counselled extensive reforms, but he had not insisted, since he was not supported by the Conservative majority of the new Legislative Assembly; and actually such reforms were impracticable under a theocratic regime. The French occupation of Rome and the Austrian occupation of Romagna were equally hateful to the people, while Antonelli, the Secretary of State, who put little trust in France, did his best to manœuvre between the two powers.

In Naples Ferdinand II abolished the Constitution *de facto* and governed the State with the completest absolutism. Two great prosecutions of the members of the society *Unità Italiana*, and of those involved in the events of the 15 May, ended with the sentences of January 1851 and October 1852. Among those condemned to the

galleys for life or for a term were Carlo Poerio, Luigi Settembrini and Silvio Spaventa. The misgovernment of the Bourbon ruler provoked the indignation of Mr. Gladstone, who wrote the famous letters in which he denounced this government as "the negation of God."

In Piedmont Victor Emmanuel II (1849-1878), an energetic and resolute sovereign, after some initial hesitation made the cause of Italian independence and liberty his own, henceforth to be bound up with the destinies of his House. For the time being, of course, it was out of the question to think of war with Austria; he must rather seek to uplift the country by means of opportune internal reforms. The first of these reforms were ecclesiastical. By the Siccardi law (so called after the Minister of Justice who introduced it) the ecclesiastical court and the right of asylum were abolished, the number of religious feasts was diminished, and a check was placed on the increase of ecclesiastical property. During the debates on this law the deputy Camillo Benso, Count Cavour (*b.* 1810), enunciated a new principle of government: the government should show that constitutional institutions are capable of progress, thereby drawing into their orbit the more advanced elements in the State. Soon after this he was called into the Cabinet by D'Azeglio as Minister for Agriculture—he was an extremely competent agriculturist—and then Minister for Finance (1850-1852). He concluded commercial treaties with France and England, partly with the object of entering into closer political relations with these states, and he tended more and more toward the Liberal Left. In May 1852 he resigned from D'Azeglio's cabinet, and after the fall of the latter he was invited to form a new cabinet, which he did (4 November 1852) with the support of Urbano Rattazzi, of the Left Centre, who some time afterwards entered the cabinet as Minister of Justice, afterwards Minister for the Interior. At this time Cavour himself held the portfolios both of Finance and Foreign Affairs, and he began, from this period, a career of manifold and indefatigable activity, guided, in the pursuit of his vast political aims, by a pliant and resourceful spirit, which was ready to exploit any element and adapt itself to any circumstances, and by an unshakable faith in the liberal and parliamentary regime.

In the domain of internal politics he boldly developed the policy which he had proclaimed as a deputy. By the law of 1855 various religious Orders were deprived of their juridical personality; the revenues of the episcopal sees were diminished, and a supertax was imposed upon ecclesiastical properties. This law evoked the keenest opposition from the Catholics and Conservatives; the king himself, who was greatly attached to the traditional religious beliefs, was by no means satisfied with it, and was on the point of dismissing Cavour. The law was condemned by the pontiff, and there was open strife between Piedmont and the Papal court.

In respect of Italian aspirations Cavour behaved with prudence and adroitness, giving the Liberals to understand that they must rest their hopes on Piedmont, but that they must at the same time refrain from provoking Austria. He protected the *émigrés*, but he also expelled some of the more heavily compromised and turbulent. But when the Austrian government, after the events of the 6 February 1853, sequestered the property of the *émigrés*, even of those who had become Sardinian subjects, Cavour protested vehemently, and persuaded the Chamber to vote a sum of money to subsidize these same *émigrés*. This quarrel was followed by a rupture of diplomatic relations.

Cavour very well understood that Piedmont unaided could never hope to conquer Austria, and with his cool and penetrating vision he clearly perceived the difficulties and the dangers which a democratic and popular insurrection might bring upon the monarchy. It was his ambition to set Piedmont at the head of the national movement, in the hope of creating at all events a kingdom of Upper Italy. But he intended that the initiative of this movement should remain with the government, thereby safeguarding the existence of the monarchy and the dynasty. The notion of Italian unity seemed to him a hypothetical conception, remote from immediate reality. The conflict between his policy and that of Mazzini—who continued his propaganda even after the 6 February, thereby provoking unsuccessful risings in Lunigiana—was fundamental, and the two men cherished a lively personal aversion for each other.

A capital point of dissension between them was the fact that Cavour

relied above all upon the friendship of a foreign and absolute potentate, Louis Napoleon, who on the 2 December had effected a *coup d'état*, proclaiming a new authoritarian constitution, and who a year later had restored the Napoleonic Empire for his own benefit, assuming the name of Napoleon III. The new sovereign had retained his youthful sympathies for the national cause of Italy (§ 109), and above all, as a matter of Napoleonic tradition he was opposed to Austria and the Treaties of Vienna.

Before the aspirations of Cavour and Napoleon III could be realized there must be a change in the international situation which would break up the absolutist bloc of the three Northern powers. The way to this was opened by the outbreak of war over the Eastern question in March 1854; war between Russia on the one hand, and France and England, allied with Turkey, on the other. It was known as "the Crimean War" because the Western powers had despatched their military forces to the Crimean peninsula in the Black Sea. They sought the support of Austria, who assumed an attitude hostile to Russia, and occupied the Danubian principalities, but did not take part in the campaign. In order to induce her to intervene the French and British believed that her rear must be safeguarded in Italy, and they therefore urged Piedmont to take part in the war. The majority of Italians, even of patriotic Italians, could not understand why they should leave their country to fight for a non-Italian cause and an Austrophile policy. Mazzini in particular was extremely hostile to the notion of Piedmontese intervention. Cavour, on the other hand, saw that here was an opportunity of forcing Piedmont to take a hand in the game of European politics, and of drawing her closer to the Western powers. He therefore supported the policy of King Victor Emmanuel (who was extremely desirous of making the campaign in order to re-establish the prestige of the Piedmontese arms); also, he did not wish to be dismissed and replaced by a government of the Right. A treaty of alliance was concluded on the 26 January 1855, and 15,000 men were sent to the Crimea, to distinguish themselves in the battle of the Chernaya (16 August). Sebastopol was occupied in September, and then Austria assumed a more openly hostile attitude to Russia. At the beginning of the following year Tsar Alexander II,

himself to concluding peace, to define the terms of which a congress assembled in Paris at the end of February 1856.

To the Congress of Paris, notwithstanding the opposition of Austria, Piedmont was admitted, along with the Great Powers. She was represented by Cavour, who sought opportunities of diverting the debate to the conditions prevailing in the other Italian states, showing that these were such as to constitute a permanent danger of revolution, and contrasting with them the very different conditions obtaining in Piedmont; and during the labours of the Congress he succeeded in gaining the friendship of Russia, full of resentment against the ingratitude of Austria. On the 8 April Walewski, summing up the labour of the Congress, drew attention to the conditions in Italy; Austria protested, while Great Britain approved of his attitude. Cavour then presented a memorandum to the representatives of France and Great Britain, and a little later these two powers addressed severe remonstrances to the King of Naples in respect of his methods of government, and when the king rejected their intervention they broke off diplomatic relations (October 1856). The fact that the Italian question had been submitted to Europe increased the prestige and popularity of the Sardinian kingdom and its minister, although it had no immediate practical consequences.

Henceforth the Liberals rallied more and more round the House of Savoy, and there were even many republicans among them, who had deserted Mazzini, who was more than ever suspicious of Cavour's policy, and considered that it was imperilling the cause of Italian unity and independence. He himself was keeping an eye on the kingdom of Naples, where there were the beginnings of a movement in favour of a son of Joachim Murat. Mazzini, therefore, went to Genoa in 1857, with a view to making secret preparations for an expedition to Naples under the leadership of the patriot Carlo Pisacane. In order to assure the expedition of a base he promoted an attempted insurrection (29 June), which was a complete fiasco. Pisacane's expedition, landing at Sapri on the Salernitan coast, was destroyed by the Bourbon forces and the people (June-July). Pisacane fell in action. The chorus of imprecations against Mazzini was louder

than ever; the most furious of his detractors was Cavour, who spoke of hanging the agitator in the Piazza dell' Acquasola in Genoa (where his monument stands to-day). Pisacane's sacrifice was a serious blow to the supporters of Murat, and strengthened the position of the unitarians, while the persistence of Mazzini's activities goaded Cavour to further effort, and contributed not a little to persuade Napoleon III to intervene in favour of the Italian cause. The foremost figure among the dissident republicans was Daniele Manin, who on the 1 August constituted the *Società Nazionale*, with the programme of a unitarian monarchy under the House of Savoy. In the following month he died, but the resources of the society rapidly increased, very largely owing to the efforts of the secretary, the Sicilian refugee Giuseppe La Farina. Cavour protected it, and was able to exploit it to great advantage. The federalistic republicans (Ferrari, Cattaneo), held aloof from it, being opposed both to the Mazzinian and to the monarchical unitarianism, as they wished to see Italy reconstructed on a basis of regional autonomy.

§ 116. THE WAR OF 1859 AND THE ANNEXATION OF EMILIA AND TUSCANY.—Napoleon's decision was taken after the unsuccessful attempt on his life (14 January 1858) by the republican Felice Orsini (who had broken with Mazzini). The Emperor angrily blamed Piedmont for being unable to suppress the Mazzinist plots; and the Piedmontese government endeavoured to give him satisfaction while preserving the national dignity. At the same time, Napoleon III allowed the advocate who was defending Orsini to read in court a letter of the prisoner's in which he urged the Emperor to liberate Italy. The Emperor invited Cavour to a secret conference at Plombières (20–21 July 1858), at which it was decided that France would support Piedmont were the latter country attacked by Austria; and that Piedmont should seek to provoke such attack. In the case of an attack the war would be fought in order to constitute a kingdom of Upper Italy (extending to the Isonzo, with the Duchies and Romagna) under Victor Emmanuel. In compensation France would receive Nice and Savoy, which she had long desired. An Italian Confederation would then be established under the presidency of



the Pope, who would retain Latium. In short, Napoleon did not envisage the creation of an Italy, but of a kingdom of Upper Italy, which would weaken Austria, and a Confederation over which he expected to assert his power, not without advantage to France. Further, Napoleon III asked the hand of the Princess Clothilde, Victor Emmanuel's daughter, for Jerome Napoleon.

Very soon a great ferment was at work throughout Italy; a ferment increased by the words uttered by Napoleon III at the New Year's reception to the Austrian ambassador: "It pains me that our relations with your government are not so good as in the past;" and the temperature of the people rose to fever-heat at the recollection of a sentence spoken by Victor Emmanuel II (by agreement with Napoleon III) on the opening of Parliament (10 January 1859): "While we respect treaties, we are not insensible to the cry of suffering that rises toward us from so many parts of Italy." At the end of January the treaty of alliance between France and Piedmont was signed, and at the same time (30 January) the marriage of Jerome Napoleon and Clothilde of Savoy was celebrated.

Meanwhile volunteers were being incorporated in the regular army, and arrangements were made with Garibaldi, who shortly afterwards was created a general of the Sardinian army, for the constitution of the *Cacciatori delle Alpi* (Alpine Huntsmen). Great Britain, favourable to Austria, as she feared a more powerful France or Russia, made an offer of mediation, which was refused by Napoleon III and by Russia. They proposed a Congress instead, but Austria purposed to exclude Piedmont and to insist upon her immediate disarmament. Great Britain, anxious at all costs to save Austria from going to war, proposed a general disarmament, which Cavour was obliged to accept (21 April); but as the negotiations encountered various obstacles, Austria decided at length to send Piedmont an ultimatum, demanding her unilateral disarmament (23 April). The ultimatum was rejected (26 April). At last the war had come.

The Austrians, commanded by Gyulai, crossed the Ticino on the 29 April in order to crush the Piedmontese before the arrival of the French; but they were slow in moving and were hampered by the artificial flooding of the countryside. In the meantime 100,000 French-

men arrived, with Napoleon III himself; he had already announced in a proclamation (3 May) that he intended to liberate Italy as far as the Adriatic, and that he was assuming the command of the allied forces. The Franco-Sardinian army defeated the Austrians at Montebello (20 May) and Palestro (30-31 May) while they were preparing to oppose a presumptive advance of the enemy upon Piacenza, the bulk of the allied armies crossing the Ticino further to the north. Gyulai, becoming at last aware of the turning movement, disputed their passage at Magenta (9 June) in a great battle, which the arrival of McMahon decided in favour of the allies. The road to Milan thus being clear, the two sovereigns entered the city on the 8 June, amidst the delirious joy of the people. The Austrian troops retreated in good order upon the Quadrilateral, covered by their rearguard, which was hurled back in a bloody encounter at Melegnano (8 June). Meanwhile Garibaldi, operating with his Alpine corps on the extreme left of the allies, ejected Marshal Urban from Varese and San Fermo (26 and 27 May), occupying Como, and then Magenta, Bergamo and Brescia.

The war and the victories of the allies overthrew the governments of Tuscany and Emilia. On the 27 April the Grand Duke of Tuscany (who had rejected the alliance offered by Cavour), confronted by a hostile patriotic demonstration, abandoned Florence and the Grand Duchy without resistance. A provisional government was constituted; Victor Emmanuel II agreed to extend his protection to Tuscany, and nominated a ministry, in which the principal figure was Bettino Ricasoli, who set his face against all intrigues in favour of a restoration or an autonomous kingdom under Jerome Napoleon, who landed at Leghorn on the 23 May with a French army corps. On the 27 April Massa revolted, and then Carrara; Francis V, after Magenta, took refuge in Mantua, and a provisional government proclaimed the annexation of Modena to Piedmont, which was accepted by Victor Emmanuel, delighted to dispossess a sovereign who had sent his troops to help Austria. Shortly afterwards Luigi Carlo Farini was appointed governor. The victory of Magenta resulted also in the departure of the Duchess of Parma and the proclamation of the annexation of the duchy to Piedmont. The Austrians evacuated Piacenza

and Romagna; in Bologna, on the 12 June, a demonstration organized by the National Society persuaded the Cardinal Legate, Milesi, to abandon the city. A governmental *giunta* was constituted, which offered the dictatorship to Victor Emmanuel II, who for the time being contented himself with a vague reply. On the 14 June a provisional government was constituted in Perugia, but on the 20th the city was retaken by the Papal Swiss, not without pillage and the killing of unarmed citizens, of which Cavour and the Liberals took full advantage in exciting and increasing the popular hostility to the Papal government. Other risings in Umbria and the Marches were suppressed.

The outcome of these risings in Central Italy naturally depended on the result of the war. The Austrian forces, having re-organized themselves within the Quadrilateral, and Francis Joseph himself having come to assume the command, with General Hess as his chief of staff, recrossed the Mincio, occupying the heights of Solferino and San Martino. Here the Franco-Piedmontese forces advanced to the attack. After sanguinary fighting the French occupied Solferino, which was the key to the Austrian positions, and the Piedmontese San Martini (24 June). At this point Napoleon III called a halt for various reasons; among them being the unpopularity of the war with a large section of the French people (especially the Catholics) and the hostility of Prussia and the Germanic Confederation. He offered Francis Joseph an armistice, after which the two Emperors concluded the preliminaries of Villafranca (11 July). By this Lombardy was ceded to Napoleon III, who was to hand it over to the King of Sardinia; Venice, with Mantua and Peschiera, were to remain in the possession of Austria, who in respect of this territory would enter into a confederation of the Italian states under the presidency of the Pope; and the sovereigns of Tuscany and Modena would be restored; how, was not suggested.

In Italy the preliminaries of Villafranca excited a storm of indignation, which destroyed much of the popularity which Napoleon III had acquired, and enhanced the prestige of Mazzini, who had predicted the new Campoformio, and who now, proceeding to Central Italy, vigorously resumed his unitarian activities. For a moment Cavour

found himself in agreement with him; he resigned power, proposing to retain his liberty of action and to frustrate the agreement, especially where Central Italy was concerned. The Piedmontese commissaries withdrew from the Duchies, Romagna, and Tuscany; the understanding *de facto* with Piedmont remained, and the heads of the various provisional governments (Farini in the Duchies, Leonetto Cipriani in Romagna, Ricasoli in Tuscany) called an assembly of their constituents, who voted for annexation to the kingdom of Victor Emmanuel (August and September). A military league was constituted between Tuscany, Romagna, Modena and Parma, with Manfredo Fanti in command of the army, and under him Garibaldi. By the Peace of Zürich, concluded on the 10 November, the pacts of Villafranca were confirmed, the rights of the dispossessed sovereigns to be finally determined by the decisions of a congress; but this congress never assembled. Romagna joined itself to the Duchies under the dictatorship of Farini, and the Piedmontese government, although it did not accept the nomination by the four Assemblies of Prince Eugene of Carignano as regent, sent Carlo Boncompagni to him in a quasi-ambassadorial capacity. Great Britain and France were agreed to observe the principle of non-intervention. Cavour, returning to power on the 20 January 1860, applied himself at once to solving the problem of Central Italy, agreeing with Napoleon III that plebiscites should be held in these provinces; a gesture which pleased the Emperor—whose own power reposed in theory on a plebiscitary basis—and the result of the plebiscites was an almost unanimous vote in favour of union with the constitutional monarchy of Victor Emmanuel and his successors in the dynasty (11 and 12 March). In return, Piedmont ceded to France (24 March) Savoy and Nice—of which nothing more had been said after Villafranca, since Napoleon had not complied with the Plombières agreements—a cession which was to take effect, however, only after a plebiscite, which was held on the 15 April. The Pope launched his excommunication against the occupiers of his dominions, and proceeded to organize an army of his own, in which the French legitimists proceeded to enlist, and whose commander was a proscrip of the 2 December, General Lamoricière.

§ 117. THE EXPEDITION OF THE THOUSAND AND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE KINGDOM OF ITALY.—Ferdinand II of Naples had died (22 May 1859) during the war in Lombardy. He was succeeded by his son Francis II, a weak and incapable youth. Cavour had invited him to participate in the war against Austria, taking advantage of his refusal to discredit him in the eyes of the Liberals. An insurrection was brewing in Sicily; the first outbreak occurred on the 4 April in Palermo, at the convent of La Gancia, and another followed two days later in Messina; but these were easily repressed. Nevertheless, armed bands were formed, which rallied round Rosolino Pilo, Prince of Capece. In order to support and defend the rebellion an expedition was got ready in Genoa by the efforts of Sicilian exiles (chief among whom was Francesco Crispi) and with the assistance of the *Società Nazionale*; and behind this, of course, the indefatigable Mazzini was at work. The king and Cavour refrained from interference, and the expedition, consisting of little more than a thousand volunteers, under the command of Garibaldi, left at dawn on the 6 May on the steamers *Lombardo* and *Piemonte*, belonging to the Società Rubattino. Disembarking at Marsala on the 11 May, Garibaldi marched inland; on the 14th, at Salemi, he assumed the dictatorship, with the motto "Italy and Victor Emmanuel"; on the 15th he defeated the Bourbon forces at Calatafimi, while the Sicilian volunteers, the *picciotti*, flocked to his colours in ever-increasing numbers, and the enthusiasm began to spread. The Bourbon forces having been diverted by a feigned attack upon Corleone, Garibaldi was able to march upon Palermo, which he entered on the 27th after a sharp engagement. The city at once became full of barricades; the royal troops were repulsed and their communications with Naples cut off; on the 30th they asked for a truce of 24 hours, which was afterwards prolonged, ending in the armistice of the 6 June, by the terms of which General Lanza undertook to evacuate the city and the island. Garibaldi, created a Secretary of State by the government, whose most important member was Crispi, his troops having been reinforced by further enrolments of *picciotti* and additional drafts from Upper Italy, occupied the whole island, excepting Messina, and on the 20 July he again defeated the Bourbon forces at Milazzo.

At last Messina also (excepting the citadel) was cleared of the enemy.

In Naples Francis II had in the meantime decided to proclaim the Statute (25 June), agreeing to the demands of Piedmont, with whom he had begun to negotiate, on the advice of Napoleon III. Cavour spun out the negotiations, while he continued to keep an eye on Garibaldi, seeking at the same time to provoke a rising in Naples before the hero's arrival, in order to limit his influence in the interests of the Sardinian state. But in this he was unsuccessful: Garibaldi, on the 20 August, crossed the Strait and began a triumphal march amidst the enthusiasm of the people, while the Bourbon troops, completely demoralized, with officers who were going over to the cause of the revolution, dispersed or surrendered without resistance. Liborio Romano, Minister of the Interior, persuaded Francis II to retire to Gaeta, and invited Garibaldi to enter the capital, which he did on the 7 September. The opposition of Great Britain had prevented Napoleon III from intervening to keep Garibaldi in Sicily.

The dictator, while remaining faithful to the ideal of the unitary kingdom, announced that he wished to proclaim this in Campodoglio, and to postpone the annexation until then. In Sicily he replaced the prodictator Agostino Depretis, who was in favour of immediate annexation, by Antonio Mordini. But already Cavour, in order to control the Garibaldian movement, had resolved upon despatching an expeditionary force to Naples, which was to proceed through Umbria and the Marches, and convincing Napoleon of the necessity of preventing Garibaldi from marching on Rome, he obtained from him a promise of *de facto* tolerance and the recommendation to make haste. The disorders provoked in various of the cities of these regions were the diplomatic pretext for intervention. Victor Emmanuel, in a proclamation to the expeditionary force, announced that he wished to restore order in Italy and save Europe from the perils of revolution, and he protested his intention to respect "the seat of the Church" and his readiness to guarantee its independence "in agreement with the allied and friendly powers." The Papal government was required to disband Lamoricière's army, and even before its refusal to do so was known two army corps, under General Della Rocca and Cialdini,

who were themselves under the supreme command of Fanti, crossed the frontier on the 11 September, occupying respectively Umbria and the Marches. At Castelfidardo, between Osimo and Loreto, Cialdini (18 September) defeated Lamoricière's Papal troops, which consisted largely of foreigners. Perugia had been occupied on the 19th; on the 29th Ancona surrendered, after bombardment by the Sardinian fleet, commanded by Persano. A plebiscite was then held to settle the question of annexation (4 and 5 November).

Meanwhile the Bourbon troops had made their last attempt, attacking the Garibaldean army on the Volturno, but after a hard-fought engagement they were repulsed (1 October). Immediately after this battle Victor Emmanuel marched into Neapolitan territory, preceded by a proclamation in which he re-affirmed his intention of restoring order and of terminating the era of revolutions in Italy (9 October). On the 21 October the plebiscite for annexation was held in Naples and Palermo. On the 26th Garibaldi, meeting Victor Emmanuel at Teano, saluted him as King of Italy, and accompanied him, on the 7 November, to Naples, embarking on the 9th for Caprera. The suggestion advanced by Mazzini (who had gone to Naples), of a national Constituent Assembly which would decide upon the new organization of Italy, was not realized, as Garibaldi did not support it. The war was ended by the royal troops with the taking of Gaeta (13 February 1861). Francis II withdrew to Rome.

Besides the sovereigns directly interested, Austria, Russia, Prussia and France had protested against the proceedings of Piedmont. But Cavour's policy was as clairvoyant as it was audacious; he was perfectly acquainted with the international situation. Austria would willingly have attacked Piedmont, but the Tsar would not guarantee his own neutrality, and at the Conference of Warsaw (October 1860) he dissuaded Francis Joseph from taking such a step; and as a matter of fact the Austrian ruler had Hungary to deal with. Louis Napoleon's last objections were overcome by Great Britain, who induced him to withdraw the French squadron which was preventing the blockade of Gaeta.

On the 18 February the new parliament, which could henceforth call itself the Italian Parliament, assembled in Turin. A law containing

a single article: "King Victor Emmanuel assumes for himself and his successors the title of King of Italy," was approved by the Senate on the 28 February, by the Chamber on the 14 March, and sanctioned on the 17th by the king, who entitled himself "King of Italy by the grace of God and the will of the Nation," thus reconciling the monarchical tradition with the principle of popular sovereignty; and in order to demonstrate the continuity of the monarchy and the State, he continued to call himself Victor Emmanuel II, and not Victor Emmanuel I, as many would have preferred. A Parliamentary debate provoked by Cavour gave the latter an opportunity of asserting that the true capital of Italy must be Rome, but that in order to obtain Rome it was necessary to persuade France to withdraw her troops, and further, to induce the Pope, together with the Catholic world, to accept other guarantees than the temporal power for the liberty of his ministry. And the debate was concluded on the 27 March with the vote on the motion "that Rome, the capital acclaimed by national opinion, be united to Italy."

Cavour laboured with alacrity to achieve this end, seeking on the one hand to secure the withdrawal of the French troops and on the other to come to an agreement with the pontiff, and attempts to open negotiations with Pius IX were made on Cavour's behalf by Father Passaglia and by Pantaleoni. It was Cavour's proposal that the Pope should renounce the temporal power, obtaining in return full liberty for the Church in ecclesiastical matters, in accordance with the principle of "a free Church in a free State," which he hoped would have the effect of renovating the Church. The negotiations had already come to a standstill when the great statesman died (6 June) at the early age of fifty-one, to the very great loss of Italy.

§ 118. VENICE AND ROME.—The new cabinet, with Ricasoli at its head, was confronted with an accumulation of formidable problems. The new State had to be organized from the foundation, due provision had to be made to meet the financial situation, the problems of Rome and Venice had to be considered, and the impatience of the "party of action"—so called because it wished to take immediate action—had to be restrained while a solution was being sought. However, Ricasoli



and his successors, nearly all of whom belonged to the parliamentary Left, boldly attacked their task, which they pursued with constancy and energy. Minghetti, Minister for the Interior, submitted the draft of a law for the administrative organization of the kingdom, which envisaged extensive decentralization; but it was not adopted, and thereafter the centralizing tendency prevailed. With the question of decentralization was linked that of the South, since many southerners held that it was inopportune to apply in the South laws created for Piedmont and Upper Italy, and would have preferred a certain regional autonomy. The discontent swelled the ranks of the bands of irregulars which had been formed during the advance of the Bourbon army (which had been dissolved) and which was now reinforced by brigands. This so-called Southern brigandage, encouraged by Francis II, and by the tolerance, on the frontier, of the Papal government, took many years to suppress, notwithstanding the extremely severe methods adopted by the Italian generals. The State budget showed a deficit of more than 300 million lire, while it was necessary to provide for enormous expenditure. However, the recognition of the Kingdom of Italy by France, and then by other powers, improved the financial situation by restoring foreign credit.

At the beginning of 1862 Ricasoli, attacked by Right and Left alike on account of his rigidity, was replaced by Rattazzi. The latter seemed inclined to tolerate the agitation carried on by the party of action, and by Garibaldi, for the annexation of Rome and Venice, so that on the Trentino frontier the party actually began to organize an expedition against Austria; but then he suddenly had the first nuclei of volunteers arrested at Sarnico and Palazzuolo (May). Demonstrations followed, and an angry protest from Garibaldi, who, having returned to Sicily, was beginning to recruit volunteers, and although the king disavowed him in the proclamation of the 3 August, he crossed over into Calabria and advanced in the direction of Rome. At Aspromonte he was confronted by troops under the command of Colonel Pallavicini. There was a brief exchange of rifle-shots (29 August). Garibaldi was wounded in the ankle, and he was then taken as a prisoner to Varignana, near Spezia. An amnesty set him and his men at liberty. The Rattazzi ministry resigned on the 1 December

and was replaced by the Farini ministry. Shortly afterwards Minghetti became premier.

Garibaldi and others of the party of action (which had had for its organ various committees and associations, first the *Società emancipatrice*, and then the *Comitato centrale unitario*) began to negotiate with Hungary and the Poles, with a view to an insurrection against Austria, or perhaps a revolt in Russian Poland. The ministry and the king were not unaware of this: the king even entered into relations with Mazzini, also with a view to action against Austria; but nothing was decided. The negotiations with the French government, on the other hand, led to the "September Convention" (14 September 1864), by which Italy pledged herself not to attack the Papal State or allow it to be attacked, while France was to withdraw her troops, little by little, as the Papal army was organized, recalling them all within the maximum term of two years. A secret clause linked the implementing of the agreement with the removal of the capital from Turin to Florence. But the secret leaked out, with the result that in Turin, on the 21 and 22 September, there were violent demonstrations and sanguinary conflicts, which led to the resignation of the Minghetti ministry. In the new cabinet constructed by General Lamarmora Giovanni Lanza was Minister for the Interior, while the Minister for Finance was Quintino Sella, who had already been in office with Rattazzi, and who now applied himself with energy to the restoration of Italian finances. The new cabinet secured the approval of Parliament for the Convention, and in June 1865 it achieved the removal of the capital.

The September Convention did nothing to improve relations with the Pope. Pius IX had of recent years been endeavouring to increase his power over the whole Catholic world, opposing every tendency that was not absolutely orthodox and entirely favourable to complete subordination to the pontiff, and he had been becoming more and more petrified in his resistance to the ideas and tendencies of the age. A famous manifestation of this attitude of his was the Encyclical *Quanta cura* (8 December 1864), which condemned the principles of the religious neutrality of the State, liberty of opinion and of the Press, the absolute sovereignty of the people, and the juridical sup-

remacy of the State over the Church. To this Encyclical was annexed the "Syllabus" or summary of "the principal errors of our times," consisting of 80 propositions condemned by the Pope in various previous documents. Amongst other things the principle of religious liberty was condemned, and the assertion that "the Roman pontiff can and should become reconciled to progress, Liberalism and modern civilization." The Syllabus caused a great sensation and was interpreted as a condemnation of all modern ideas; Victor Emmanuel and Napoleon III prohibited its publication. The Syllabus also condemned the proposition that the abolition of temporal power might be profitable to the Church; on this point, indeed, Pio Nono was immovable.

The Syllabus had the effect of embittering the quarrel between the Pope and the Italian State. Direct negotiations between the king and the pontiff in respect of filling various vacant episcopal sees were unavailing. The Roman question was none the less given a rest, for the possibility of solving the Venetian question presented itself, thanks to the conflict between Austria and Prussia for hegemony in Germany, which had now become acute.

Prussia under King William I and Bismarck (1815-1898) was pursuing in Germany the policy of Piedmont in Italy, except that it had no dealings with revolutionists and relied mainly on authoritarian government and armed force. In preparation for the war against Austria, Bismarck concluded a treaty with Italy (8 April 1866) by which Italy pledged herself to attack Austria whenever Prussia commenced hostilities. Austria without more ado offered to cede Venetia to Italy, but Italy refused to break her pledges. In the middle of June, accordingly, the war broke out. The Prussians were completely victorious, defeating the German allies of Austria, and the Austrian army itself (3 July) in the great battle of Sadowa or Königgratz in Bohemia, after which they marched to Vienna.

In Italy the progress of the war was very different. The Italian army and navy were superior to the Austrian. The king assumed command of the army, with Lamarmora as his chief of staff, while Ricasoli became President of the Council. Lamarmora was to operate on the Mincio, while Cialdini, descending the right bank of the Po,

was to enter Polesine and attack the flank of the enemy. The Austrian commander, the Archduke Albert, unexpectedly assailed Lamarmora's troops at Custoza, where they were strung out over a long line, and he was able to attack the various detachments one by one. Among them, at Villafranca, was the division of the crown prince Umberto, who sustained the charges of the Austrian Uhlans in a square of the 99th infantry. The valiant General Pianell, formerly of the Neapolitan army, checked the advance of the enemy, who finally withdrew (24 June). This was an engagement of little importance, which left the general military situation unchanged, but the supreme command interpreted it as a great defeat, and it was a long while before Lamarmora and Cialdini, who were enemies, could agree to resume the offensive. Meanwhile Austria, defeated at Sadowa, offered Venetia (4 July) as the price of Napoleon's assistance, but the offer was rejected. Garibaldi, operating in the Trentino with a body of volunteers, and supported by the regular troops of General Medici, defeated the enemy on the 4th July at Montesuello, took the fortress of Ampola on the 19th, defeated the enemy again at Bezzecca, and made for Trent. Medici, after defeating the enemy at Borgo Val-sugana, was also marching upon Trent. The main Italian army advanced into Venetia, which the Austrians hastily evacuated.

In the Adriatic the fleet of Admiral Persano was for a long while inactive in the face of the weaker and less modern fleet of Tegethoff; but at last it attacked the fortified island of Lissa. Tegethoff then approached, and since the Italian fleet was divided into three lines, which gave no support to one another, he was able to deliver isolated attacks on several ships, sinking the flagship *Re d'Italia*—which Persano had left for the *Affondatore*, a change which resulted in great confusion—and burning the *Palestro*, which blew up. The commanders of the two ships, Faà di Bruno and Cappellini, chose to go down with them, and the greater part of the crews perished also. Tegethoff then withdrew, with his fleet almost untouched, into the Lissa channel, while Persano made for Ancona (20 July).

On the 22 July Prussia concluded a truce with Austria, and on the 24th Italy did the same. The preliminaries of Nikolsburg were then signed by Prussia and Austria. Italy, now isolated, had to abandon

all hostilities, concluding the armistice of Cormons (12 August); Garibaldi, recalled from the Trentino, responded with his famous "Obbedisco" (I obey). By the Peace of Prague (23 August) Austria abandoned Germany to the hegemony of Prussia, who formed, under her control, a Germanic Confederation of the North, annexing various German states. On the 3 October the Peace of Vienna was signed by Austria and Italy. This sanctioned the concession of Venetia to Italy, Napoleon III acting as intermediary. Italy had to renounce the Trentino and Venezia Giulia, which meant the abandonment of what were not only very important national aspirations, but were also strategical necessities if Italy was to have a proper frontier; and thus was created the abnormal state of affairs between Italy and Austria which lasted until the Great War. On the 21 and 22 October a plebiscite voted almost unanimously for the union of Venetia with the kingdom of Italy.

The campaign and the unsatisfactory peace gave rise to general discontent, which resulted, in Sicily, perturbed by a regionalistic agitation, in the outbreak of serious disorders, especially in Palermo, where they were suppressed with bloodshed.

Now that the Venetian question was solved there remained the problem of Rome. The disputes with the pontiff became more and more embittered; and this fact was partly due to the law of 1866 relating to the suppression of religious corporations, and the failure of fresh negotiations in respect of the vacant episcopal sees. Ricasoli then elaborated a proposal which tended, in substance, to separate Church and State; but the elections of March 1867 yielded results which were contrary to his policy, and he was replaced by Urbano Rattazzi, who proceeded without more ado to liquidate the property of the religious congregations, and also to redistribute and reduce the episcopal revenues and the chapters of the cathedrals, while he allowed Garibaldi to make preparations for a *coup de main* against Rome, hoping that Napoleon III would regard it with tolerance. However, the threatening behaviour of France led him to adopt a different attitude; he had Garibaldi arrested at Sinalunga (24 September) and sent him back to Caprera. About a month later, on the 20 October, Garibaldi evaded his watchers, landed on the coast of Tuscany, and

made for the Roman frontier, which had already been crossed, during the first days of October, by companies of volunteers. Rattazzi had hoped that the king would intervene and settle the Roman question; it seems that he was encouraged by the king and then abandoned, and on the 19th he resigned. During the difficult ministerial crisis that followed (on the 20 October) the brothers Enrico and Giovanni Cairoli left Terni with seventy-six comrades for Rome, where, according to agreement, an insurrection was to break out. But the insurrection was limited to the exploding of a mine which blew into the air part of the Serristori barracks, and to a trifling skirmish at Porta San Paolo. They got no further than Villa Glori on Monte Parioli, where they were attacked on the 23rd by the Papal forces. In the fighting Enrico was killed and Giovanni seriously wounded. On the 25th there was a clash in Rome between the Liberals and the Papal police, in the Chiari woollen manufactory, where bombs and weapons had been deposited, and here Giuditta Tavani was killed, the wife of the conspirator Arquati. Garibaldi, crossing the frontier at Passo Corese, took possession of Monterotondo on the 26th, and on the 29th pushed on to Ponte Nomentano; but since there was no insurrection in Rome he decided to retire. On the 27 October General Menabrea had formed a new Conservative ministry, and the king issued a proclamation in which he definitely disowned the volunteers; which was not enough to restrain Napoleon III, under pressure from those about him, from landing an expeditionary force at Civitavecchia, which began to enter Rome on the 30 October. At Mentana, on the 3 November, Garibaldi, while retreating, collided with the Papal and French troops (whose *chassepots*, according to them, did wonderful execution) and was defeated. On the 9th, at Passo Corese, the rest of the Garibaldeans laid down their arms; Garibaldi was arrested and taken in custody to Varignano and then sent back to Caprera. The Italian government, in a circular to the powers, reaffirmed the rights of Italy over Rome, while in Paris the minister Rouher declared amidst the unanimous applause of the Legislative Corps that "never, never" should Rome be Italian. The French troops remained in Rome.

For Italy there followed three years of discouragement and confusion, during which the republican movement gained in strength,

being nourished by Mazzini, who had definitely broken with the monarchy, and signs of social unrest were beginning to make their appearance. It seemed to the government that the Roman problem could be solved only by agreement with Napoleon III. But Napoleon was contending with increasing difficulties, both at home and abroad. In view of the alarming aggrandizement of Prussia, who was now drawing the states of Southern Germany closer by means of treaties, Napoleon III thought to come to an understanding with Austria. Since Sadowa Austria had undergone a radical transformation, having effected a compromise with Hungary (December 1867), which constituted the dualistic Austro-Hungarian monarchy as it endured until the Great War. An understanding with France, directed against Prussia, was not displeasing to the Austro-Hungarian government; but Austria could not take the field unless she were certain of Italy; hence the negotiations between the three powers in 1868 and 1869. Italy asked for Rome as the price of agreement, and the Austrian chancellor, Beust, accepted this condition; but not so Napoleon III, who feared the French Catholics. Even the new liberal and parliamentary Empire founded early in 1870 did not dare to take such a step. Pius IX, for his part, was more than ever determined not to give way. In June 1868 he convoked for the following year an Oecumenical Council in the Vatican, to which, for the first time, the Catholic states were not invited to send their ambassadors. The Council, which opened its sessions in December 1869, overriding the opposition of a small but active group of bishops who objected to the definition of Papal infallibility, declared on the 18 July 1870—after nearly all the opponents of the doctrine had withdrawn—by 533 votes out of 535, that the pontiff, when *ex cathedra* he defines doctrines relating to the faith and morals, enjoys the same infallibility as that which the Saviour has granted the Church; and that he possesses complete and ordinary power in all dioceses whatsoever.

On the following day, the 19th, France, in conflict with Prussia over the candidature of a Prussian prince for the throne of Spain, declared war. All the Germanic states rallied to Prussia, and the war resulted in the utter defeat and invasion of France, the fall of the Empire (4 September 1870), the capitulation of Paris (28 January

## THE FORMATION OF THE UNITARY STATE

1871), and the peace preliminaries of the 26 February, sanctioned by the Peace of Frankfort (10 May) by which France lost Alsace-Lorraine.

The defeat and fall of the Napoleonic Empire determined the destinies of Rome. In August 1870 the French garrison was recalled from Rome. Napoleon III, after the first disasters, had appealed for assistance to Victor Emmanuel II, who at first was rather inclined to give it; but the Lanza ministry, which at the close of 1869 had replaced the Menabrea ministry, refused to allow Italy to implicate herself in the quarrel. (This very largely owing to the efforts of Sella.) The arrival of Jerome Napoleon in Florence (24 August) did nothing to change this state of affairs; on the other hand, the government, incited by public opinion, began to make preparations for despatching an expeditionary force to Rome under General Raffaello Cadorna. On the 6 September (two days after the fall of the Napoleonic Empire) the September Convention was denounced; and the other powers were informed that it had become necessary to occupy Rome. There were some reservations, but no effective opposition. Beust, indeed encouraged the Italian government.

A message from Victor Emmanuel to the Pope was unavailing; Cadorna crossed the frontier, and on the 18th he was before the walls of Rome. Pius IX had given orders that the troops were to offer only such resistance as was necessary to substantiate the charge of violence; but his orders were not strictly obeyed by Kanzler, the commander of the Papal army. However, the engagement fought on the morning of the 20th was very brief, and a breach having been opened near Porta Pia, the Italian troops entered the city. Its surrender was agreed upon in a convention between Kanzler and Cadorna. The Papal army was disbanded, and at the invitation of the Pope the Italian troops occupied the Leonine City, which was excluded from the capitulation. A provisional government by *giunta* was instituted, which made preparations for a plebiscite. This was held on the 2 October, the results, in the city, being 40,785 Ayes and 46 Noes.

The situation of the pontiff was conditioned by the "Law of Guarantees" (13 May 1871), by which he was assured of sovereign honours, and the possession, with immunity from the jurisdiction of the State (extraterritoriality), of the Vatican, the Lateran, and the



villa of Castel Gandolfo; an annual dotation was assigned to him, and he was guaranteed complete liberty in the exercise of his spiritual ministry. The State renounced all intervention in the life of the Church, maintaining the *exequatur* and the *placet* only in respect of the destination of ecclesiastical properties and the provision of the major and minor benefices (episcopal sees, parishes, etc.). Thus the Italian government had succeeded in regulating the position of the pontiff, reassuring the foreign powers, but at the same time avoiding any risk of intervention by them, a matter of supreme importance to the Italian State. The Pope, however, regarded himself as placed "under hostile domination," and shut himself up in the Vatican, holding that the temporal power was necessary to the independence of his ministry, and that any other attitude would have seemed like acceptance of the *fait accompli*, and would therefore have diminished his independence in the eyes of the Catholic world, by giving him the appearance of a subject of the Italian government.

## CHAPTER XX

### ITALY SINCE 1870

§ 119. THE UNITARY ITALIAN STATE.—The kingdom of Italy, constituted in 1861, and completed, as regards its essential elements, between 1866 and 1870, is the first Italian State—at least, in the modern sense of the word “State”—ever known to history. It was explained in an earlier chapter (§ 12) that the extension of the rights of the Roman citizen to the whole of Italy did not lead—since the functioning of political life remained essentially urban—to an effective, equal and united participation of the whole Italian population in the life of the State. Between the Italic municipal autonomies and the political centre of Rome there was no organic and constitutional tie. By the institution of the Empire and its evolution (the increasingly absolute power of the Emperor on the one hand, and on the other the extension of citizenship to the whole Empire and the placing of Italy and the provinces on the same level of equality), the cues for the formation of an Italian State were withheld, and there was a direct transition from the civic State to the imperial State. Italy in its totality remained a part of the Roman Empire (dependent upon Constantinople in the later period) until the Lombard invasion, when it was split into two parts, Imperial Italy and Lombard Italy; and in neither of these two Italys did the Italian people participate in the political government of the country, but in both of them it was, so to speak, the object and not the subject of history. The kingdom of Italy, the continuation of the Lombard kingdom, was subordinated to the new Empire of the West, never comprising *de jure*—still less *de facto*—the whole of Italy; and as far as its political and social constitution went, it was for some centuries not so much an Italian State as a collection of governments of foreign feudatories imposed upon the Italian population.

The Italian people returned to self-government with the communes,

which, however, came into being as so many local autonomous formations within the existing imperial kingdom, without any political bond between them. Nor did the communal system, in its most efficient form, extend beyond Central Italy: the kingdom of the South, even when its political activities constituted a bond with the North, was entirely distinct; there a number of dynasties of foreign origin succeeded one another, maintaining (except at first) political and dynastic ties with the outer world. By the 15th century there was a more definite political constitution in certain of the great states, which were actually independent in spite of ties of formal subjection (the duchy of Milan was a fief of the Empire, the kingdom of Naples a fief of the Church, etc.). These states were entirely independent of one another, and there were also a great many smaller states. From the beginning of the 16th century the country was subject to the rule of foreigners, who, although they did not absolutely suppress the individuality of the pre-existing Italian states, extended their rule over a considerable part of the peninsula (now larger, now smaller), and exercised a preponderant influence over the rest. These foreign rulers disappeared with the constitution and completion of the kingdom of Italy, which therefore represented a new formation, although it had absorbed so many historical elements.

This new formation solved the two fundamental problems of the political life of Italy—*independence and unity*—envisaging them as indissolubly connected. It will be understood that in order to safeguard these conquests there was a prevailing tendency to give the new State a strongly centralized organization. Hence, therefore—more than for other reasons which have already been mentioned—the success of the monarchical solution as against the republican, with the consequence that the concentration upon Piedmont and the monarchical and dynastic interests were fresh impulses toward the victory of the centralizing system. Thus, although they had powerful spokesmen during the *Risorgimento* (§ 115) and were apparently supported by historical traditions, the partisans of local autonomies—not only in the extreme form of federalism, but also in the more temperate form of regional, provincial and municipal autonomies (cf. § 118)—were utterly defeated.

The politico-administrative organization of the new State as it operated from 1859 to 1871 was strongly reminiscent of the French system from the time of Napoleon. The entire State being divided into a certain number of provinces (without any grouping of these in accordance with the historical regions or other criteria) each of the provinces was connected with the central government through a functionary who was known as a "prefect," as in France. However, there was an elective representation of the province (Provincial Council, Provincial Deputation) with inadequate powers. Each province was divided into districts (*circondari*) under sub-prefects (abolished some years ago) and the districts were divided into communes. In the communes the local administration was confided to elective municipal councils which appointed from their midst an executive committee (*giunta*); at their head was the syndic, who for a long while was appointed by the government. The syndic was at the same time an official of the central authority, charged with the execution of such tasks as it demanded, such orders as it issued. Even in respect of the local administration the syndic, the *giunta* and the council were subject to governmental control, which might go so far as to annul improper decisions, or dissolve the communal council and replace it by the temporary government of a commissary. The competence of the communal administration did not go beyond the local administrative interests.

The central government, constituted on the model of the parliamentary and constitutional governments of Western Europe, consisted of the cabinet or council of ministers, nominated by the king, one of the ministers being charged by the king to preside over the council; he was generally the minister whom the sovereign had charged with the formation of the ministry. Juridically the sovereign's right to appoint and revoke ministers was unrestricted; but from the first application of the Albertine statute it was a matter of regular constitutional practice that the king should follow the indications of the Chamber, whether positive or negative, in selecting the person charged with the composition of the ministry, in approving the list of ministers drawn up by him, and in keeping the ministry in power, or dismissing it. Therefore an explicit vote of no confidence in parliament, or even

a contrary vote on important questions, led to the resignation of the government, though in practice the king could refuse to accept the resignation and refer the government back to the Chamber, and he could dissolve the Chamber itself, convoking another within the statutory term.

§ 120. THE PARTIES. THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RIGHT.—Notwithstanding the constant regard of the Crown for the indications of Parliament in respect of nominations, there was not in Italy a completely parliamentary government of the British type, with the alternation of two parties, as in Italy the constitution of the parliamentary parties or groups was less clear-cut, and there were a great many of them. Hence the monarch had more initiative, and influence might be exerted by extra-constitutional advisors, such as the minister for the royal household. However, in the first ten years after the union of Rome with Italy the division between Right and Left, with its consequences in the formation of the government, was in practice definite enough. The two parties emerged from the division between those who wanted an Italy in close agreement with and dependence upon the monarch and his ministers, and the so-called party of action, which appealed to popular initiative. After 1870 the division was effaced by events; but there was still another cause of opposition between the two parties, a logical and historical consequence of the first; the Right was substantially the continuation of the governmental structure created by Cavour, based on restricted suffrage, with a certain tendency to oligarchy or government by clique or camarilla, and a certain distrust of democracy and the masses of the people, its ideal being a strong State, controlling the political life of the nation, but respecting the law and the liberty of the individual; whereas the Left represented the fusion or commingling of those opponents of Cavour and his successors who had remained in the monarchical and constitutional fold, but were not without contacts with the extreme or republican elements, and who manifested, on the whole, a more popular character, a more democratic tendency, and were in favour of extending the suffrage, and of granting greater liberty to political manifestations of even a constitutionally unorthodox kind. They

were, moreover, in favour of a relaxation of the fiscal burden; and lastly, as regards the relations between Church and State their attitude was more conspicuously anticlerical. On the margin of this constitutional Left (led by Rattazzi until his death in 1873, then by Depretis) more radical or republican elements had their being, which were the more downright vestiges of the party of action. The most conspicuous figure among these elements was Garibaldi; but the parliamentarians of this type gathered about Bertani. Outside Parliament there were the pure or Mazzinian republicans; Giuseppe Mazzini, who lived until 1872, flatly denied that the new monarchical State realized the ideals of the Risorgimento, and even disputed its legality, since it had not emerged from constituent assemblies. The younger republicans, however, were inclined to break away from Mazzini, whom they regarded as unduly conservative in the social and religious domain, being as they were influenced by Socialist agitators and by the Workers' International (International Working Men's Association). This latter had been founded in 1867, largely by the efforts of Karl Marx; but in Italy Bakunin had given it an anarchistic tendency. Garibaldi also declared himself a socialist and internationalist, though he had no clear understanding of the movement or any effective desire to work for it.

The two ministries of the Right, Lanza's (1809-1873) and Minghetti's (1873-1876), were chiefly concerned to balance the State budget, in which the deficit had increased to about 130 millions, a very large sum for those days. Sella, who was Minister of Finance under Lanza, practised "economy to the bone," and a productive indirect tax which he imposed in spite of the popular hatred of it was the tax on flour. On the eve of his fall Minghetti, who was his own Minister of Finance, was able to announce that the budget was balanced. Under these ministries the important task of organizing the new national army was accomplished, the Minister for War being Ricotti: military service was made obligatory for all, and the army was divided into three classes (permanent, mobile and territorial), of which only the first was retained with the colours for three years, constituting ten army corps of a total strength of 350,000. For budgetary reasons expenditure on the army was more restricted than the Left would have wished. There was a great increase of railroad

construction, and in 1871 the Fréjus tunnel was opened. The census that year gave the population as 26,800,000. The government of the Right was opposed more vigorously than ever by the Left, which in June 1873 constituted a "Progressive Association" under Rattazzi, Crispi and Mancini. In August 1874 Minghetti ordered the arrest, at Villa Ruffo in Rimini and elsewhere, of the leaders of the "Alleanza Repubblicana" (Suffi, Fortis) and of the Italian section of the International (Costa), and the struggle against the ministry became fiercer. This ministry, in the elections of November 1874, still obtained the majority, but it was a scanty one.

The two governments of the Right quietly faced Pius IX's attack upon the Italian State, an attack delivered with the most absolute obstinacy, and often with the most violent appeals to the Catholic peoples, calling upon them to intervene on behalf of the Papacy. The suppression (1874) of the religious Orders in Rome (apart from the households of the Generals) and the abolition of clerical exemption from military service (1875) provoked even angrier protests from the pontiff. The irreconcilable temper of the Pope spread to the bishops, who refused to ask for the royal *exequatur* on entering into possession of their episcopates, with the result that in 1875 more than thirty of them were expelled from their sees. For some years after 1870 the Roman question was the central fact of Italian foreign policy. The greatest anxiety of the Italian government was to ensure that no foreign power should encourage the Pope in his hostility and make his claims their own. It had no concrete fears of this nature save in respect of France, where the clericals were very strong in the National Assembly, while Italian unity was regarded—owing to superannuated prejudices of the *raison d'état* order—as harmful to France, even outside the clerical domain. The danger was intensified after the President of the Republic, Thiers, had to make way in May 1873 for General McMahon, a clerical monarchist. The French government, however, realizing the dangers which would threaten from Germany if it should assume an aggressive attitude, resisted the clerical pressure. In October 1874 the French vessel *Orénoque*, which had been stationed off Civita-vecchia since 1870, in case the Pope should be in need of a place of refuge, was recalled.

The conflict with the Papacy and the dread of a Papal and anti-Italian French policy, afforded a natural basis of friendship between Italy and Germany, where Bismarck was engaged in the *Kulturkampf* against the Catholic Church. The Italian government, however, took very good care to avoid being dragged in the wake of the Chancellor in the anticlerical struggle, keeping to its own carefully considered line of conduct, despite Bismarck's resentment. Nor did Visconti Venosta, who was then Minister for Foreign Affairs, pursue a Franco-phobe policy, confining himself to standing on the defensive, and even doing his best to maintain friendly relations with France. At this period Italy's relations with Austria were even more intimate than with Germany, a fact which from time to time caused some anxiety in Berlin. In September 1873 Victor Emmanuel, accompanied by Minghetti and Visconti Venosta, visited both Vienna and Berlin, but no international engagements resulted from these visits, which were returned by Francis Joseph in April 1875, when he went to Venice, and by Wilhelm I in October, when he visited Milan.

§ 121. THE LEFT IN POWER. TRANSFORMISM. TUNIS AND THE TRIPLE ALLIANCE.—On the 18 March 1876—when the question of the railways was on the *tapis*, Minghetti being in favour of their operation by the State, while the Left and the Tuscan Centre were opposed to this policy—the government was defeated in a division on a point of procedure which it had treated as a vote of confidence or the reverse. (It was defeated by 242 votes against 181.) The king charged Agostino Depretis, the leader of the opposition, with the formation of a new government, and on the 25th he formed a cabinet which consisted entirely of members of the Left, with Nicotera Minister for the Interior, Melegari (a Mazzinian of 1831, who for many decades had been a monarchist) Minister for Foreign Affairs, and Mancini Minister of Justice. The elections held in November—not without a previous shifting of prefects—gave the new government a very large majority. Visconti Venosta, Spaventa and Bonghi were not elected. The majority, however, was not compact; it was divided into more or less progressive factions, greatly complicated by personal groups. Apart from the government, it



contained such men as Benedetto Cairoli, Crispi (who became President of the new Chamber), Zanardelli, and Baccarini. The reform programme of the Left was partly realized; the Coppino Act (1877) provided for gratuitous and obligatory education, with religious instruction optional upon the wishes of the parents; the burden of taxation was lightened (the tax on flour was abolished in 1880); but the suffrage was not extended until 1882, when the *scrutin de liste* was introduced (abolished in 1892, when the single vote by ballot was restored). The minimum age of the voter was reduced from 25 years to 21, the requisite rent from 40 lire to 19, and the cultural standard to the elementary certificate of the second class. The number of electors rose from half a million to three millions. The more advanced democrats had repeatedly demanded universal suffrage and the reform of the statute. The financial organization of the railways, the property of the State, was that of the private companies, which had been established in 1885 by the railway conventions. The more secular temper of the new government was manifested by the abolition of the religious oath in the law courts from June 1876, and above all by the proposed law against clerical abuses, which gave rise to an international Catholic agitation, incited by violent protests from Pius IX, and which, though approved by the Chamber, was rejected by the Senate (1877). The new government's loyalty to the monarchy was unexceptionable, and in 1877 the internationalistic agitation of Cafiero was suppressed. The military budget was augmented, and in 1882 the army corps were increased from 10 to 12. Provision was made for the navy by continuing the work begun by the previous ministry, and by the launching of great ironclads (*Duilio*, *Dandolo*, *Italia*, etc.) which were the "Dreadnoughts" of their period, and which gave Italy a position of naval primacy.

In December 1877, Nicotera being defeated in the Chamber in connection with a harmless violation of the secrecy of the telegraph service, Depretis formed a second ministry with Crispi at the Ministry for the Interior. From this time onward the governmental crises were more frequent, although the Left continued in office; through the resignation of Crispi, who was accused of bigamy, Depretis was replaced by Cairoli in March 1878. During the second Depretis

ministry Victor Emmanuel II died (9 January 1878), and his death was followed by that of Pius IX (7 February). The Conclave was peaceful, and Leo XIII (1878-1903) was elected: Gioacchino Pecci, who was not the candidate of the more intransigent cardinals, but who none the less kept the demand for temporal power alive, though for some years he cherished a desire for reconciliation. The monarchy suffered nothing by the succession of King Humbert, who was generally liked for his personal qualities, even among the republicans.

The two Prime Ministers, Depretis (who in his second ministry was also Minister for Foreign Affairs) and Cairoli (whose Foreign Minister was Corti) had to deal with the Eastern crisis which was provoked by the Russo-Turkish War (1877-1878) and settled by the Berlin Congress (June-July 1878). The king, the government and Crispi had great hopes, at the close of 1877, of an agreement with Germany, directed against France (where in May McMahon had effected a sort of *coup d'état* in favour of the Right) and Austria. It was hoped to obtain the Trentino from Austria in exchange for Italian acceptance of the union of Bosnia with the Empire, or even to make war on Austria, cancelling the treaty of 1866. But neither Germany nor Great Britain approved of such a course; and Italy, having failed to exploit the possibilities of compensation in time, left the Congress "with clean hands," while Great Britain occupied Cyprus, and France, with the approval of Great Britain, and above all of Germany, made secret arrangements to occupy Tunis.

About this time there was the first notable development of Irredentism; that is, of the movement in favour of the reunion of the Italian territory of Austria to the Italian State, which was supported above all by the elements of the extreme Left, and was to a great extent a movement of opposition to the monarchy. About 1880 relations with Austria became strained, and Italy found herself completely isolated, for Germany and Austria were mutually bound by the alliance of 1879, Russia entered into an understanding with the Central Empires by the treaty of 1881 (the "Alliance of the Three Emperors," which had a definitely conservative basis), and Bismarck's policy was openly in favour of France. Under the third Depretis ministry (December 1878-June 1879) and the two ministries of Cairoli (July

1879—May 1881), who from November 1879 was associated with Depretis, Tunis became a capital problem of Italian politics, for Italy had extensive financial and moral interests in the country, and feared the consequences of a French occupation. The Italian government, while in theory maintaining the political *statu quo*, wished to develop Italian influence as far as possible; but the result was to accelerate the activities of the French, who in May 1881 established the protectorate. This check-mate led to the fall of Cairoli; after an attempt to form a mixed cabinet Depretis returned to office, where he remained until his death (29 July 1887), reconstituting the ministry on several occasions. It was then, with Minghetti's assistance, that he introduced the policy of "transformism": that is, the juxtaposition and combination in Parliamentary majorities, and in the cabinet itself, of elements of the two old parties, while the Left remained in control, and while a section of the Left (in particular the "Pentarchy" of Cairoli, Nicotera, Crispi, Zanardelli and Baccarini) was in opposition to its old chief. Italy's isolated position appeared perilous to the governing circles; and not only in respect of her foreign policy, but also because they were afraid of a republicanism that might receive support from France, in conjunction with the temporalistic policy of Leo XIII, who was seeking supporters in Paris, Vienna and Berlin. (The Pope was particularly nervous and hostile since the deplorable disturbance of 13 July 1881, when the body of Pius IX was being removed, and had repeatedly entertained the idea of leaving Rome.) Hence King Humbert's visit to Vienna (October 1881), and the conclusion of the Triple Alliance with Austria and Germany (20 May 1881), Mancini being then Minister for Foreign Affairs (from 1881 to 1885). Italy and Germany exchanged mutual pledges of support against a French aggression, and Austria likewise pledged herself in such an event to come to the help of Italy. There was also the *casus foederis* in which two or more Great Powers should attack one of the allies, and a pledge of benevolent neutrality if the attack should come from one power only. The treaty made no stipulations in respect of Italy's Mediterranean and Balkanic interests: nor, considering the circumstances under which it was concluded, would it have been practicable to obtain such. Soon after this an opportunity for external activity

presented itself: Great Britain requested the co-operation of Italy in her occupation of Egypt in the summer of 1882. The offer was not accepted, because Mancini persisted in his notion of a European concert to oppose British and French predominance in Egypt, and was kept in suspense by the ambiguity of the Bismarckian policy and the fear of compromising himself with France; to say nothing of the Italian public's intense disapproval of the British action as a violation of Egyptian nationality, and the suspicion that Italy would merely be working for the benefit of others. The international position of Italy was even more unfavourable after the renewal, in 1884, of the treaty between the three Empires, and the closer *rapprochement* of Germany and France. In these circumstances the occupation of Massawa, in February 1895, undertaken by agreement with Great Britain, who feared that France might establish herself there, may be regarded as a courageous initiative. It was Mancini's hope that the occupation would be the beginning of Anglo-Italian co-operation in Egypt and the Sudan (he had thoughts of an Italian garrison at Khartoum), then in the throes of the Dervish insurrection. But these hopes vanished, for after the fall of Khartoum Great Britain decided to take no further action.

Financial conditions, during the first few years of the government of the Left, continued to be good, with a surplus on the budget. But the policy of increased expenditure, resulting from the natural growth of the new State, and from the increasing pressure of the electoral masses, was followed by the reappearance of the deficit in 1882, and by 1888 this had increased to more than 250 millions. During this period the financial portfolio was almost always in the hands of Magliani, who was only too skilful in manipulating balances in such a way as to conceal the actual state of affairs. Economic conditions were particularly bad in the South, which owing to its backwardness was much less conscious than Upper Italy of the advantages of unification. The discontent of the middle classes in the South had contributed in no small degree to the victory of the Left over the Right; but the expected amelioration did not follow from the change of government, for the possibility of improvement was dependent on a great number of factors. The condition of agriculture appeared to be particularly

serious, as was shown by the agricultural inquiry voted by Parliament in 1877, over which Jacini presided. An attempt was made to improve matters by instituting agricultural colleges and experimental stations; and the Forestal Institute of Vallombrosa was established to teach the technique of reafforestation. Emigration, which began to increase about 1880, served as a means of escape from the poverty of the peasant. And yet, considered as a whole, the economic condition of Italy was improving. Industrial development increased after 1880; and the nascent industries were assisted by the protectionist tariff reforms of 1878 and 1887. The 4,580 miles of railway which existed in 1876 had become 6,200 by 1885; and in 1882 the St. Gothard tunnel was opened. In 1881 the "Navigazione generale Italiana" was constituted, and in 1885 protectionism in the form of subsidies was introduced for the benefit of the mercantile marine, which was unable to cope with foreign competition. The 500 millions in the savings banks in 1872 had increased to 1,000 millions by 1882; while foreign trade increased from 1,000 millions in 1862 to 2,500 millions in 1882. The mutual benefit societies, already numerous before 1870, continued to increase, and so did the people's banks, promoted by Luigi Luzzatti. The census of 1881 showed that the population had increased to 28 millions.

The labour unrest which was beginning to manifest itself by widespread strikes was due in some degree to defective economic conditions, but also to the awakening of the social conscience. The anarchist movement began to give ground before the more organic and legal movement which in 1882 led to the formation of the "Independent Labour Party"; in 1886, however, this was dissolved by Depretis, and in June of that year a congress of working-men's societies declared itself in opposition to his government. Left and Right were of one accord in opposing the nascent Socialist movement; but there were also elements in both parties (Minghetti, Depretis, and between them Sidney Sonnino, who became the leader of a "Centre") who were of one accord in opposing the Conservatives and "pure" Liberals and demanding a social policy directed toward the amelioration of the conditions of the working classes, and the prevention of class conflicts. Something was done in this direction

by the institution (1883) of the National Fund for accident insurance, though this depended on voluntary contributions, and by the passage of legislation (1886) relating to the work of women and children and the liability of employers in cases of accident. But the right to strike was still contested; and in 1886 a bill conceding this right was rejected by the Chamber. From 1882 onwards a new deputy, Giovanni Giolitti, who was one of the most resolute adversaries of Magliani's financial policy, drew attention to the importance of the social problem.

§ 122. ITALIAN CULTURE IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—The Italian culture of the late Risorgimento and the following period (that is, of the second half of the 19th century) appears on the whole inferior to that of the preceding period, as though a living impulse had halted and stagnated; yet it also had noteworthy characteristics, corresponding with the new needs of the age. In literature there was an end of the absolute predominance of political and patriotic motives (of which there is conspicuous evidence in the *Lezioni di letteratura italiana* by the patriot Luigi Settembrini: 1813–1877); while it was marked by greater artistic value, a wider contact with general interests of humanity and the reality of everyday life, and a closer relation with the literary movements of Europe. In poetry the “Second Romanticism” had still a long career before it (§ 111); with the leader of the school, Prati, were associated Aleardo Aleardi (1812–1878), whose musical but invertebrate *vers libre* was full of rather tenuous romantic sentiment, and who sometimes chose historical subjects, and Giuseppe Regaldi (1809–1883), whose verse was descriptive and didactic. This school was followed by the “Third Romanticism,” which was distinguished by greater originality of form and sentiment, but was unbalanced and lacking in artistic finish. The intellectual centre of this school of poetry was Milan, and its leading exponent was Emilio Praga (1839–1875), while other members were Giovanni Camerana (1845–1905), who committed suicide, and Arrigo Boito (1842–1918). A new classicism, dignified in form and inspired by an exalted morality, but lacking in any profound poetic inspiration, was represented by the priest Giacomo Zanella (1820–1888).

In fiction, immediately after the middle of the century, there were two writers who, although they inherited their material and their motives from the preceding period, marked a notable transformation, for with their wider and more objective observation and representation the historical novel evolved into the psychological and social type of fiction. One of them, Giuseppe Rovani (1818-1874), in the cyclic romance *Cento anni*, attempted, though with somewhat inadequate powers, a vast reconstruction of Italian society from the middle of the 18th century to the middle of the 19th. A much greater novelist was Ippolito Nievo (1831-1861), a Garibaldean volunteer, who in *Confessioni di un ottuagenario* drew a wonderfully vivid picture, suffused with a vague melancholy, of the moribund society of 18th century Venetia, afterwards continuing the narrative, though with less striking success, down to 1848. The work of these two writers did not create a tradition, and has no relation to the fiction of the following period. A comparable figure in the world of the theatre was Pietro Cossa (1830-1881), with his historical dramas, in which the manner of Alfieri was abandoned for a broadly human touch and great variety of form.

The last thirty years of the century, those which we may call the Humbertian period, produced few conspicuous figures, but they brought Italy into closer relation with the culture and literature of the rest of Europe. The realism of the French novel made its appearance in Italian fiction, and a later influence was the Russian novel. Of this period were Gerolamo Rovetta (1851-1910) and Matilde Serao (1836-1922), while Giovanni Verga (1840-1922), after a first romantic period, produced work which was distinguished by a completely original realism and a stark vitality (*I Malavoglia* and *Mastro don Gesualdo*). Antonio Fogazzaro (1842-1911) derived from the Manzonian tradition, especially in his masterpiece, *Piccolo mondo antico*; but he was also considerably influenced by the foreign psychological novel.

In the work of Edmondo De Amicis (1846-1908) we find impressions of travel, moral reflections, and observation of society; he also wrote short stories and historical sketches, and he produced an extremely successful educational work (*Cuore*). He blended a sentimental romanticism with a naïve realism. In the theatre Giacinto

Gallina (1832-1897) was a late disciple of Goldoni, while Paolo Ferrari, a fertile writer of comedies, abandoned the tradition of Goldoni to write comedies or dramas *à thèse* in the French manner. Still more closely affiliated to the French drama—especially to that of Becque—was Marco Praga, the son of Emilio Praga (1862-1929), one of whose most typical works, *La moglie ideale*, was brought to life on the stage by that very great artist, Eleanora Duse. Praga's name may be coupled with that of Gerolamo Rovetta, who has already been mentioned. Giuseppe Giacosa (1847-1906), beginning with poetical plays of the romantic school (*Una partita a scacchi*), went on to write comedies and dramas of the modern Gallic type.

The robust social organism represented in the French novel, and still more in the French drama, had not its counterpart in Italy. On the other hand, Italy, as was her habit, produced a great isolated personality in Giosuè Carducci (1835-1907), a poet who was nourished by the whole tradition of Italian literature, and was also well acquainted with the literature of Europe. His poetry is classic in form and conception, romantic and modern in feeling; inspired by memories of antiquity, by the mediaeval history of Italy, and the history of the French Revolution, no less than by the political life of the period; by the spectacle of nature no less than by personal emotion and sexual love.

The fame and the influence of Carducci were slow in maturing. Less famous and less influential was Alfredo Oriani (1852-1909); novelist, historian, writer of comedies and journalist; too little regarded in his lifetime, overvalued and misrepresented since his death. His was a curiously complex personality; as a writer his aspirations were greater than his powers of realization. His best-known work is *Lotta politica in Italia* (1892), a magniloquent and suggestive presentation of Italian history.

The afternoon of Giosuè Carducci coincided in time with the dawn of Gabriele D'Annunzio (1863-1938), who very quickly won fame as a poet and novelist, and later as a dramatist. In him the Italian literary tradition, predominantly a tradition of virtuosity of form, was superimposed on contents derived from foreign literatures and from contemporary life, whose inspiration was conspicuously



sensual and egocentric. His work, therefore, contained nothing of the robust moral vitality of his predecessor, but it had very great merit as a representation (sometimes by anticipation) of certain tendencies of our own time. D'Annunzio was the youthful luminary of a literary world which found expression in the reviews *Fanfulla della Domenica*, *Domenica letteraria*, *Cronache bizantine*, of which the first two were edited by a versatile and witty writer of the Gallic type, Ferdinando Martini (1841-1928), who was also a politician of some distinction. Another member of this literary world was Cesare Pascarella (b. 1858), whose Romanesque poetry, deriving from Belli, reached epic heights in *Villa Gloria* (1885) and *La Scoperta de l' America* (1893).

Another solitary was the literary critic, Francesco De Sanctis (1818-1883), of whom we have already spoken (§ III), but whose work, which took the whole of Italian literature for its domain, was produced almost entirely after the middle of the century. He was a historico-aesthetic critic of the arts, who in his literary work sought to represent the artistic phantasy and the intimate life of the artist, and to show them in relation to the whole temporal world. During his life the influence of this writer (who was also a deputy and a minister) diminished instead of increasing, by reason of the prevailing positivistic tendency to accumulate erudite and exoteric particulars. This tendency had its merits as a school of method, and as regards the collection and classification of material; and it produced some works of value, in particular that of Adolfo Bartoli (1833-1894) and Alessandro D'Ancona (1835-1914).

The same tendency, and perhaps even more exclusively, prevailed in the writing of history. An immense amount of most valuable work was done by the various regional "Deputazioni di Storia patria," with their periodicals, and by the "Istituto storico italiano," in the way of collecting material and of special research; but there was a certain failure or even refusal to take a comprehensive view of historical developments. However, Pasquale Villari (1827-1917) produced two notable monographs on Savonarola and Machiavelli; and Giuseppe De Leva (1821-1893) must not be forgotten, the author of a history of Charles V.

Corresponding, in the philosophical domain, with the scholarship of literary and historical research, was Positivism, which prevailed so completely in Italy over the followers of Rosmini and Gioberti, and also over the Hegelian school (Spaventa, Fiorentino, Tari, D'Ercole). The way had been prepared by two writers of the Risorgimento (cf. 115), Carlo Cattaneo (1801-1869) and Giuseppe Ferrari (1812-1876), both distinguished historical experts, but very different in their critical methods. The greatest apostle of Positivism was Roberto Ardigò (1828-1920), who devoted himself to the elaboration of a complete system which might be described as a new metaphysic. But the Positivist school cannot claim the keen intellect of Antonio Labriola, who specialized in the analysis of the historic materialism of Karl Marx, the "father of scientific Socialism." Another group of scholars who were not of the Positivist school included Cantoni, Masci, Barzellotti and Chiappelli, whom we might call neo-Kantian.

The Italian art of the Humbertine period was on the whole more backward and less productive than its literature, though it was making efforts to catch up with the art of contemporary Europe. Romanticism and the historical composition still found exponents in Federico Faruffini (1831-1869) and Stefano Ussi (1822-1901); a sentimental romantic, whose misty colouring was original, was Tranquillo Cremona (1837-1878). Genre painting was practised by the brothers Domenico (1815-1878) and Gerolamo (1849-1887) Induno, who had preserved some of the traditional characteristics of the Venetian school. The influence of modern naturalism was visible in the work of Filippo Pallizzi (1818-1899), Domenico Morelli (1826-1901), and Francesco Paolo Michetti (1851-1929). A school of greater importance and greater artistic originality, revealing more affinity with the renaissance of contemporary French painting, was the Tuscan group of the "Macchiaioli" (*macchiaioli*, from *macchia*, spot, is equivalent to the French *pointillistes*), which included Silvestro Lega (1826-1895), Telemaco Signorini (1835-1901), and greatest of all, Giovanni Fattori (1825-1908). Two landscape painters of original modernity were Antonio Fontanesi (1818-1882) and Giovanni Segantini (1858-1899).

In music Giuseppe Verdi held a more dominant position than ever after the middle of the century, and in his old age he manifested a sort of miraculous rejuvenation in his *Otello*, and even more in his *Falstaff*. Before this Arrigo Boito (see above) had developed Italian operatic music under the influence of foreign composers, and especially of Wagner (*Mefistofele*, 1868, and the second version in 1875); and in conjunction with him we must mention Alfredo Catalini (1854–1893), who aimed at modernity tempered by Italian melody. During the last two years of the century a new school of Italian opera began to emerge; it was still based on melody, but it was marked by a new flexibility of form, and a certain assimilation of contemporary foreign methods. Its two greatest exponents were Giacomo Puccini (1858–1924) and Pietro Mascagni (*b.* 1863), the composers of the two extremely popular though very dissimilar operas, *Bohème* (1896) and *Cavalleria Rusticana* (1890). And there were not lacking efforts to transplant in Italy the symphonic form which was so fully developed abroad (Giuseppe Martucci, 1856–1909; Giovanni Sgambati, 1841–1914), but at the time no permanent school was created.

§ 123. THE PERIOD OF CRISPI.—General Robilant, who after a brief interval followed Mancini as Minister for Foreign Affairs (1885), took advantage of the fresh complications in the Balkans (the Bulgarian question) and the resulting dissension between Austria and Russia, together with the state of tension between Germany and France (the Boulangist movement) to claim for Italy a more prominent part on the European stage. By the end of the penultimate Depretis administration he had succeeded in concluding the second treaty of the Triple Alliance (20 February 1887), which, while the threefold stipulations were unchanged, included bilateral treaties with Germany and Austria, by which Germany pledged herself to assist Italy in the event of a conflict with France in respect of alterations of the *statu quo* in the Mediterranean, while Austria entered into a preventive understanding with Italy in respect of her activities in the Balkans, on the principle that Italy would receive compensation for permanent or temporary occupations. Depretis also entered into an understanding with Great Britain in respect of the Mediterranean,

to which Austria adhered, and this was carried still farther in 1887, though it was never actually put into operation.

The policy of the Triple Alliance was accentuated, though without any special and positive results, by Francesco Crispi, who entered the last Depretis ministry as Minister for the Interior, and after the death of Depretis in August 1887 he succeeded him in the presidency of the Council. France, alarmed and provoked by the Italo-Germanic agreement, underlined at the meeting of Crispi and Bismarck at Friedrichsruhe (October 1887), entered upon a policy of reprisals, first of all in the economic domain, by terminating all commercial agreements and beginning a tariff war. This was felt more especially by the South, which had no outlet for its wines. France was vainly hoping by means of the economic war to induce Italy to withdraw from the Triple Alliance. The tension between the two countries during the first Crispi administration was almost continuous, and it was increased by his excitability, and the deadly aversion in which France held him. It was manifested either by alarms of war in the Mediterranean (such as that of July 1889, caused by a false report which Crispi had received from an informant in the Vatican) or in the colonial domain (Italian interests in Tunis, fear of French usurpations in Tripolitania). Germany and Great Britain, to whom Crispi kept on appealing, responded reluctantly, especially after Bismarck had been replaced (1890) by Caprivi. Crispi's policy of "Triplicismo" met with opposition in Italy from certain elements of the Right, and from the extreme anti-monarchical Francophile and irredentist Left, which Crispi accused of complicity with France and the Vatican. With the latter, after an appearance of conciliation in May 1887, the conflict became more embittered than ever, reaching its culmination when in 1889 a monument to Giordano Bruno was inaugurated in Rome. Leo XIII and his new Secretary of State (since June 1887) Rampolla had hopes of obtaining, by a *rapprochement* to France and Russia, and with their approval, the satisfaction of their temporalistic claims. Crispi gave a vigorous impulse to the colonial policy of Italy, for the time being with fortunate results; after the check at Dogali (January 1887) an expedition was despatched against the Abyssinians under the command of General San Marzano, who occupied Saati.

The Negus John having fallen in battle against the Dervishes, the Italian government decided to promote the succession of Menelik, King of Shoa, from whom they thought they had obtained, in the Treaty of Ucciali (2 May 1889), recognition of the Italian protectorate. The Italian possessions on the Red Sea were constituted as the colony of Eritrea, and the Sultanates of Obbia and the Mijertins on the shores of the Indian Ocean, which had accepted the Italian protectorate, became Italian Somaliland, so that Abyssinia was invested on the south-east as well as on the north.

In the domain of internal politics Crispi, as Prime Minister (1887–1891), gave a considerable impulse to the cause of administrative and legislative reform; the Zanardelli penal code (1889) was adopted, and the death penalty was abolished; new communal and provincial laws were passed, making the syndics of the larger communes and the presidents of the deputations elective; charitable institutions were reformed; sanitary legislation was introduced, and in the colonies and elsewhere abroad Italian schools were established or enlarged. In the financial domain Crispi's administration saw the culminating point of the deficit, but at the same time the first efforts to reduce it were made by the new Minister for the Treasury, Giolitti (March 1889). The state of the budget was reflected in that of the national economy, which was seriously undermined by the quarrel with France, the building crisis in Rome, and the failure of the banks. The financial and economic state of the country did not improve under the ministries of Antonio di Rudini (1891–1892), the new leader of the Right, whose Minister for the Interior was Nicotera, and Giolitti (1892–1893), whose government was entirely of the Left. Rudini, who held the portfolio of Foreign Affairs, concluded the second renewal of the Triple Alliance (6 May 1891), amalgamating the three treaties of 1887, and assuaging the bitterness of the conflict with France, though he was unable to heal it, owing to the "anti-Triplicist" attitude of the French. Under Giolitti Franco-Italian relations were further aggravated by the killing of Italian labourers at Aigues-Mortes (August 1893). Under him, too, there was the resounding scandal of the Banca Romana, the deplorable result of illegal circulation. The bank was suppressed and effective measures

were adopted for the reorganization of the banks of emission; but a parliamentary committee of inquiry made serious charges against various politicians, which were followed by party and personal conflicts. The Giolitti government resigned (November 1893), and after a difficult crisis Crispi returned to office in December.

Under the second Crispi administration there was a serious conflict between the government and the labour movement. This was in process of growth; in 1891 the First of May was celebrated for the first time, and the *Critica Sociale* was founded (edited by Filippo Turati), which familiarized the Italian people with the Marxist dialectic. In August 1892, at the Congress of Italian Working-men in Genoa, a split occurred between the working-class Socialist elements and the anti-legalitarian Anarchists; and in 1893 the Socialists founded at Reggio, Emilia, the "Socialist Party of Italian Working-men." In Sicily, where the economic conditions were particularly bad, on account of the crisis in the sulphur industry, the "Workers' Fasci" were founded; imposing in point of numerical strength, and led by Socialist organizers (among them De Felice), but without the true revolutionary spirit. Crispi, believing that the State was in serious danger, and even that the Sicilian Socialists had an understanding with France and Russia, resorted to repressive measures of extreme severity; and he did the same in respect of another disturbance in Lunigiana. Apart from the restoration of order, the chief preoccupation of the second Crispi administration was the restoration of the budget, which was effected by the Minister for the Treasury, Sonnino, by means of economies and increased taxation. The anxiety to balance the budget clashed with the needs of the African adventure, where a policy of expansion was being pursued without either a rational plan or adequate means. The Negus Menelik, insisting on a certain interpretation of the Treaty of Ucciali, refused to recognize the Italian protectorate, obtaining sympathy and some material support from the French and Russians. While the Italian relations with Menelik were still uncertain General Baratieri, opposing the Dervishes, occupied Tigrè and Kassala. Menelik finally intervened, and at Amba Alagi (December 1895) his very numerous forces destroyed the Toselli detachment, invested the fortress of Makallè, where Galliano

held out for forty days against an enormously superior enemy, and then encamped in the valley of Adowa (*Conca di Adrea*). Here Baratieri unexpectedly decided to attack the enemy; but in the battle of Adowa or Abba Garima (1 March 1896) the superior strength of the Abyssinians, and the lack of liaison between the Italian columns, resulted in the destruction of the small Italian army, notwithstanding its valiant resistance. The Negus, having also suffered heavy casualties, withdrew.

The African policy, owing to Crispi's opposition in Parliament and in the country, aggravated the discussions in respect of the authoritarian domestic policy and the "moral question." This, which was raised more particularly by Cavalotti, related in the first place to certain transactions between Crispi and the Banca Romana, which had been brought to light by Giolitti, who in his turn was accused of abstracting documents from the bank in 1893, and attacked by Crispi's government. In the course of the year 1895 these political and personal quarrels became extremely violent, and they undoubtedly contributed to the fall of Crispi, though this did not occur until after the battle of Adowa, when the Crown took the initiative.

§ 124. THE REACTION AND THE LIBERAL REGIME. ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT.—As regards the African question, under the second Rudini administration (1896–1898) the peace party prevailed over the party of revenge; a result to which the anti-colonial policy of the Extremist wing and of the Right contributed, and above all the economic state of the country, and lack of interest in the African adventure. Peace was concluded in 1896, with the abandonment of the protectorate and of Tigrè, though the Mareb-Belesa-Muna line was maintained. In the following year Kassala, whose occupation had been provisional, was restored to the British. Under the civil governor Ferdinando Martini the colony of Eritrea was organized on modest but national lines. At home the Rudini ministry—which had at first enjoyed a certain amount of support from the Extremists, by way of reaction against Crispi—was finally overthrown by the clash between the popular discontents of economic origin (though these were exploited by the "subversive" propaganda)

and the reactionary tendencies which were largely diffused among the upper classes, especially in Upper Italy. In April and May, 1898, there were popular outbreaks in various regions of Italy, the most serious being those which occurred in Milan on the 6 May, where a state of siege was proclaimed, and the military authority (Bava Beccaris) proceeded with redundant energy. Journals were suppressed, political associations were dissolved, and numerous arrests of Socialists were made (Turati, Anna Kalishov, Lazzari) and even of Catholics (Don Davide Albertario), who were awarded very heavy sentences by the military tribunals, but were amnestied some years later. All this merely added to the popularity of the extremist parties, and revived the liberal movement in the ranks of the middle classes. When Rudini's successor, General Pelloux (1898-1900), introduced measures against the right of assembly and association, and the freedom of the Press, the Extreme Left in the Chamber adopted the tactics of obstruction, and a group of deputies of the constitutional Left, under Zanardelli and Giolitti, with a few members of the Right, arrayed themselves against the government. Pelloux sought to introduce his measures by decree, which was declared unconstitutional by the Court of Cassation, and the opposition and obstruction in the Chamber increased. The Chamber was dissolved, but the elections of June 1900 increased the strength of the Extreme Left. Pelloux resigned, and a new transitional cabinet was formed by Saracco (1900-1901), by which peace was restored in the Chamber and in the country. But on the 29 July 1900 King Humbert was assassinated (by one Bresci) at Monza.

The new king, Victor Emmanuel III, when Saracco resigned in consequence of a contrary vote on the question of the dissolution of the Genoese Chamber of Labour, called Zanardelli to office, who formed (March 1901) a ministry of the Left, "looking one point to the Right," with Giolitti for the Interior and Prinetti (of the Right) at the Foreign Office. This administration marked the beginning of a new period of Italian history, the most prosperous which the country had known since the foundation of the kingdom. In respect of domestic politics the new government adopted a frankly liberal course—which in Parliament received the support of the Extremists—above all with



regard to the labour organizations, which were conceded full liberty of formation and of action within the limits of the law, the government preserving an impartial attitude in the case of disputes between capital and labour. The right to strike, no longer contested, was very freely exercised by industrial workers (the number of strikes rising from 642 in 1899-1900 to 1,852 in 1901-1902), and in agriculture the increase was proportionately very much greater (from 36 to 856), for hitherto the agricultural workers had often received only starvation wages.

This epidemic of strikes—which was greeted with violent imprecations and terrified warnings by the Conservatives—was on the whole a physiological phenomenon, and beneficial in its results, for a higher standard of life in the working classes was an urgent necessity, and entirely possible, in view of the great improvement of economic conditions. Agriculture was flourishing, thanks to extensive drainage, intensive cultivation, and more specialized and remunerative means of production. The agrarian revenue, which in the first years of the kingdom was about 3,000 millions of gold lire, rose after 1900 to 8,000 millions, representing about half the national income. The iron trade (ultra-protected, so that its protection was the cause of serious disputes in the economic domain), the engineering industries (Tosi, Breda, Fiat), the manufacture of rubber (Pirelli), the silk and cotton industries (increasing from 27,000 looms in 1882 to 78,000 in 1902), the manufacture of sugar and of artificial fertilizers, had all expanded. The electrification of industry had also made great strides, though at the same time the imports of coal had risen to a million tons per month. The capital of the joint-stock companies, which was 846 millions in 1898, rose to 1,000 millions in 1903. Foreign trade, rising in the ten years 1890-1900 from 2,000 to 3,000 millions, increased to 6,000 millions in the first decade of the new century. The trade balance showed a deficit, but this was wiped out by the 500 millions remitted by emigrants and another 500 millions brought into the country by foreigners. There was a great increase of deposits; the Banca Commerciale became an institution of even international significance, and the Credito Italiano was only second in importance. Emigration, far from diminishing, increased twofold, but it was largely temporary,

and the emigrants (as we have seen) sent home large sums of money, and many of them, especially in the south, returned to their native country in order to buy land with their savings. The budget in 1893-1898 showed the first of a series of surpluses which continued until the Great War. By 1900-1901 the surplus had already reached the figure of 68 millions, and in the early years of the century it often exceeded 100 millions. The quotations of the public debt rose above par, which smoothed the way for the conversion of the debt in 1906 from 4 per cent to 3.5 per cent (with an intermediate stage at 3.75 per cent). Italian paper money was now exchanged for gold.

In this atmosphere of liberty and prosperity the political conflicts persisted and were even intensified, but they were less embittered and less personal. In the place of the political confusion and marasmus which followed the dissolution of the historic Right and Left there emerged, though as yet its contours were uncertain, the opposition of Conservatives and Progressives. The extreme parties (Radicals, Republicans, Socialists) often confined themselves to the programme of the popular parties, in order to conquer a number of communal administrations, and so accustom themselves to the conduct of public affairs and the constitution life of the State. In Parliament they sometimes supported the government, and even the Radicals—who were “possibilists” in theory, as regards the monarchy, and had become *de facto* monarchists—repeatedly took office. On the other hand, the Turati and Bissolati socialists, in 1903 and 1911, did not respond to Giolitti’s invitations, since they believed that if they were members of the government the labouring masses would not acknowledge them as their representatives. The Socialist party received a very large number of recruits, still further increased by the evolution of the Confederation of Labour, which was constituted in Turin in 1906 as the general organization of the working classes. The Confederation was reformist in its tendencies; and within the party, on the whole, the reformist movement of Turati and Bissolati prevailed over the revolutionary movement. This, however, showed signs of life in several labour manifestations (strikes of agricultural labourers in Emilia), in which the syndicalist movement was opposed to the Confederation. But the principal manifestation of the revolutionary

movement was the general strike of September 1904, which was over in a few days, and which had no other consequences than a certain loss of votes by the Extreme Left in the political elections of November. Republicanism was declining, and almost in liquidation, defeated by the general interest in the social conflicts and by the liberalism of the government, which added greatly to the prestige of the monarchy, so that there were even those who spoke of the "Socialist monarchy."

It was in this period that the Catholics made their first entry into the political life of the country, from which they had hitherto absented themselves (taking part only in its administrative life), in obedience to the decree of the Vatican ("Non expedit"). On the death of Leo XIII in 1903, Pius X (Sarto, 1903-1914) reduced the temporalistic protest to little more than a formality, and restored normal relations between the ecclesiastical and civil authorities, while in several localities he suspended the "non expedit" for the benefit of moderates who were opposing members of the Extreme Left. This he did in 1904, and still more extensively in 1913, and in the elections of that year agreements were concluded by certain Liberals and Clericals which were known as "the Gentiloni pack." Thus a certain number of Catholics entered Parliament as deputies (not as "Catholic deputies," as they did not yet constitute a party). The Catholics also played a certain part in the social movement, producing as their charter the Encyclical *Rerum novarum* of Leo XIII (1891). Some adhered to a conservative movement, which was that most favoured by the Vatican, especially under Pius X (who suppressed "modernism," a daring movement, but with little social backing, for the transformation of Catholic culture and theology); others to a democratic movement, which under Don Romolo Murri (who afterwards unfrocked himself) came to open conflict with Rome, but was promptly liquidated.

The early years of the 20th century—the years of the pre-war period—were in some respects, as far as Italian culture was concerned, a continuation of the preceding period, and in some respects a transformation. In literature the one predominant personality was now Gabriele D'Annunzio, who with his "Terze Laudi" (*Alcione*) reached the apogee of his lyrical powers; here was the potent expression of a panic sensualism, the utterance of one of the great voices of European

literature. In *La Figlia di Jorio* he produced his dramatic masterpiece. He now began to evolve in the direction of a nationalistic art (*La Nave*), no less sensual than the art which preceded it, and much more rhetorical; more valuable for its political influence than for its artistic merit. In D'Annunzio's train Giovanni Pascoli (1855-1912) now won a somewhat belated reputation. Through his work, with all its imperfection of form, new voices made themselves heard, the utterances of Nature and the human soul. He differed greatly from D'Annunzio in his sense of human piety and cosmic bewilderment, yet he was allied to him by the secret affinity of a conscience astray in the world of sensations. We find this affinity again in another original poet, Guido Gozzano (1883-1916), the chief of what was known as the "crepuscular school" of poetry. The theatre (apart from D'Annunzio's dramas) continued in the track of the previous period, but among the old names a new one makes its appearance; that of Roberto Bracco (*b.* 1861). Sem Benelli (*b.* 1877) attempted to revive the historical drama, but he achieved only a new and inferior form of D'Annunzianism. In fiction the output was more abundant, but nothing essentially new was produced, nor was a higher level attained (but rather the contrary). Here again, to a very great extent, the old names continue to appear.

In painting modernism was triumphant and undisputed. It derived, however, from the foreign disciples of the French Impressionists rather than from the classic exponents of Impressionism. The output was very abundant. Among the more notable names are those of Emilio Gola (1852-1923), Guglielmo Ciardi (1842-1917), Ettore Tito (*b.* 1859)—the two latter being influenced by Venetian traditions—Gaetano Previati (1852-1920), who painted in a "divisionist" style of his own, Antonio Mancini (1852-1931), a sumptuous colorist, and Aristide Sartorio (1860-1932), who tended towards an academic magnificence. The "Futuristic" movement which followed after the war attempted a revolution which yielded no notable results. The finest fruits of Italian Impressionism were produced by Armando Spadini (1883-1925), much of whose work belongs to the post-war period. Other Italian names will not be mentioned here, as their bearers have settled down abroad and have become adherents of

foreign schools of painting. Sculpture still retained much of the old academic tradition in the work of Giulio Monteverde (1837-1917), Davide Calandra (1856-1915) and Pietro Canonica (*b.* 1869). The work of Leonardo Bistolfi (1859-1933) was a tormented expression of spiritual energies; while Medardo Rosso (1858-1928) produced impressionistic sculpture. Other sculptors (Dazzi, Martini, Wildt) belong essentially to the post-war period.

In music the new school of Italian opera continued to flourish, Puccini and Mascagni being joined by lesser composers (Giordano, Zandonai). The attempt to create a modern symphonic music was revived with better success; and this effort was continued and intensified after the war. (Casella, Respighi, Castelnuovo-Tedesco.)

For a really important transformation we must look to the domain of philosophy and philosophical and historical literature. This transformation was due to the intense and manifold activity (continued with unabated energy after the war) of Benedetto Croce (*b.* 1866), the exponent of a neo-idealism which frankly derives from Hegel (and therefore from the Neapolitan idealism of the Risorgimento: from Spaventa). This neo-idealism, whose principal monument is the four volumes of the *Filosofia dello spirito*, regards philosophy as a methodology for obtaining knowledge of the life of the psyche in its specific activity. His influence has been greatest in the domain of aesthetics and literary criticism, and there it is now predominant. The neo-idealism of Croce, with which was associated, in the pre-war period, the work of Giovanni Gentile (*b.* 1875), although he was the exponent of a very different philosophical conception, that of "actual idealism," was in revolt against the Positivism then predominant in the domain of philosophy as in that of history and political ethics. In the historical domain the Positivist movement was at the same time assailed by the economic movement, largely influenced by historical materialism (§ 122) (Salvemini, Volpe), which for some little time gave a remarkable impulse to the study of history in Italy. Another stimulus was the influence of the Catholic "modernism," which encouraged the study of religious history (Minocchi, Buonaiuti). Quite outside these three movements, Gaetano De Sanctis (*b.* 1871) reveals the authentic temper of the historian. In the domain

of politico-ethical literature the Crocean anti-Positivism allied itself (though its origin and its content were very different) with the attack which the politically nationalistic and intellectually irrationalistic and voluntaristic tendencies were making upon the liberal, democratic and socialistic tendencies then dominating Italian politics.

§ 125. THE GIOLITTIAN PERIOD. TRIPOLI.—The policy of the government, from the resignation of Zanardelli in October 1903 to the outbreak of the war, was almost always directed—or controlled where it was not directed—by Giolitti (1842–1928). Giolitti was at the helm in 1903–1905, 1906–1909, 1911–1914. He was replaced in the intervals by Fortis and Luzzatti, as new temporary leaders of the governmental majority, and by Sonnino—in two administrations of a hundred days, in 1906 and 1909–1910—as leader of the opposition, but without parliamentary following. The great Giolittian majorities of the elections of 1904 and 1909 were composed of Conservatives, Liberals, and Radicals; whence the expression “neotransformism.” The orientation of the Giolittian government, with all its empirical opportunism, was substantially Liberal; but it did not facilitate the formation of an organic party, and to some extent it made for the devaluation of Parliament and for personal authoritarianism.

Its ordinary political and administrative labours were of notable effect in improving the conditions of the nation. This is apparent merely from the increase in certain departments of the budget. For example, in the period 1900–1907 the expenditure on education was increased from 49 to 85 millions; on public works, from 79 to 117 millions; on agriculture, from 13 to 27 millions. The State, with irresistible energy, was constantly adding to its functions; thus, in 1906 it assumed the direct operation of the railways, which were improved and extended, and in 1910 it took over the elementary schools. An enormous number of remedial measures, applied by special laws, were introduced in Southern and Central Italy: that is, in the regions which had most need of support from the State if they were to attain the level of the rest of Italy. Social legislation was introduced in many domains: laws were passed relating to public health, charitable institutions, inexpensive housing for the people,

co-operative and agricultural societies, insurance against industrial accidents, sickness and old age, the working conditions of women and children, night work, holidays, and labour exchanges. At the same time provision was made for national defence by a greatly increased expenditure on military purposes, the expenditure on the army rising from 281 to 376 millions, and that on the navy from 135 to 167 millions.

In foreign politics the period following upon 1900 was marked by an intensified activity and a change of direction. The policy of "pure Triplicism" and tension in Franco-Italian relations was replaced by the policy of preserving the Triple Alliance as a mere instrument of defence (especially with regard to the Austrian ally) and of seeking the friendship of France, which after the Anglo-French entente of April 1904 was no longer inconsistent with the traditional friendship with England. The way had been prepared for this transformation by the new Franco-Italian commercial treaty of 1898, which put an end to the commercial war between the two countries, and by the understanding of December 1900 relating to the Mediterranean (negotiated by Visconti-Venosta, who returned to the Foreign Office in 1896), according to which France renounced her interests in Tripoli and Italy hers in Morocco. Prinetti, renewing the Triple Alliance, unchanged, in 1902 (28 June), concluded at the same time, with the French ambassador, Barrère, an agreement complementary to the Mediterranean entente, which stipulated the mutual obligation of neutrality should either France or Italy be the victim of aggression. Consequently, in the Moroccan crisis of 1905-1906, as in that of 1911, Italy gave no support to the aggressive German attitude toward France. Italian relations with Austria became more difficult—whether by reason of a revival of irredentism—intensified by the unsatisfied demand for an Italian university in Austria, and the conflicts between Italians and Slavs in Trieste and Venezia Giulia—or because of Austro-Italian rivalry in the Balkans, especially in Albania. The armaments on either side of the Austro-Italian frontier were increased, and Italy was in almost constant dread of Austrian aggression, which was indeed considered by the larger State. Much discontent was felt by the Italians when Austria annexed Bosnia in October 1908, as the

idea was general in Italy—though it had no diplomatic foundation—that Austria had no right to annex Bosnia without ceding the Trentino to Italy in compensation. The result of this state of affairs was the Italo-Russian entente, which was confirmed by the agreements of Racconigi (October 1909) relating to the independence of the Balkanic peoples. In these agreements the Italian aspirations in respect of Tripoli were recognized by Russia, as they had already been recognized by France, and (in 1902) by England.

These aspirations, which were based mainly on the necessity of preventing the whole southern shore of the Mediterranean from falling into non-Italian hands, were realized on the eve of the 50-year jubilee of the kingdom of Italy, as the result of the Italo-Turkish war, without opposition from the powers, thanks to diplomatic preparation, recent and more remote. War was declared by Italy on the 29 September 1911, and was terminated by the Treaty of Lausanne (18 October 1912), by which Turkey renounced her sovereignty over Tripoli, and immediately afterwards the annexation of Libya to Italy was recognized by all the powers. During the war Rhodes and the Dodecanese were occupied, and their occupation, despite certain diplomatic difficulties, was maintained provisionally for the time being, becoming permanent after the European War.

The Libyan war, which was very popular, was fought under the fourth Giolitti administration (Foreign Affairs, Di San Giuliano). Giolitti, while preparing for and directing the colonial venture, was anxious at the same time to maintain the Liberal-Democratic orientation of domestic politics. He introduced a system of State life-insurance and an electoral reform which amounted almost to universal suffrage (1912). By this the right to vote was conceded—apart from those who satisfied the qualifications of the law of 1882—to all who had completed their military service or who had attained the age of thirty years. The number of electors was increased from  $3\frac{1}{2}$  to 8 millions. Giolitti, however, was unable to avoid, and perhaps did not sufficiently heed, an internal transformation of the political parties and a change in the mentality of the electors, which led to a recrudescence of the political conflict and a growth of anti-liberal tendencies. In one of the Socialist parties there was a return to the combative and revo-



lutionary spirit, its leader being Benito Mussolini (*b.* 1883), since December 1912 the editor of *Avanti*. This movement, which was victorious in the party Congress held at Reggio Emilia in 1912, provoked the secession of the more resolute reformists, who under Bissolati founded the Socialist Reformist party. On the other side stood the Nationalist movement, with imperialistic and authoritarian tendencies, as hostile to the traditional Liberalism as to the Extremist parties. It entered into an alliance with certain Catholic elements.

The elections of October-November 1913, the first to be held under the new suffrage, returned to the Chamber a greatly augmented Extreme Left—the number of Socialist deputies was doubled—which had once more become aggressive. Since there was an anti-ministerial movement even in the Radical party, Giolitti resigned, and the new Cabinet was constituted, without the participation of the Radicals, by Antonio Salandra, who had left the camp of Sonnino for that of Giolitti (March 1914). In June he had to deal with Republican-Anarchist risings in Romagna and the Marches (the “Red Week”), which had the sympathy of the Revolutionary Socialists. This still further increased the political conflict between the Extreme Right and the Extreme Left.

§ 126. THE WAR.—In this domestic environment a new and more tremendous upheaval announced itself, overturning the old parties: the European War. The two Balkan Wars following upon the Libyan War of 1912–1913 had led to the partition of almost the whole of European Turkey between the Balkan States (Albania was constituted an independent State under the effective hegemony of Austria and Italy, in unstable equilibrium), and to the formation of a greater Serbia, which exercised an irredentist attraction on the Jugoslavs of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. This latter having seized the opportunity offered by the assassination of the heir to the throne, the Grand Duke Francis Ferdinand (28 June 1914), by the irredentist Serbs, for a “preventive war” against Serbia, Russia intervened on behalf of Serbia, and on the 1 August war broke out between the Triple Entente (France, Russia, Great Britain, and later on Japan) and the two Central Empires (joined eventually by Turkey and

Bulgaria). Italy, owing to the fact that the war was unleashed by the offensive action of her allies, was juridically absolved from intervening, while her interests were compromised by the Austrian attempt at hegemony in the Balkans; however, she declared her neutrality. After the first few months of European war and Italian neutrality the Italian people began to debate their line of conduct. The movement in favour of the preservation of peace (neutralism), supported more particularly by the Socialist party and by clerical circles, but also widely diffused among the middle classes, was opposed by the group which was resolved upon Italian intervention against the Central Empires. This group was reinforced by Nationalist, democratic, and even Socialist and Syndicalist elements, which combined to bring pressure to bear on the government and on public opinion. Benito Mussolini, leaving the Socialist party on account of its policy of neutrality, assumed a leading position in the Interventionist movement. The Italian government was very soon convinced of the necessity of intervention, for which, however, it would have to make military and diplomatic preparations. The former were entrusted to the Chief of Staff, Luigi Cadorna; the latter to the Ministers for Foreign Affairs, Di San Giuliano (*d.* October 1914) and Sonnino. In order to elucidate the relations between Italy and Austria, Sonnino entered upon negotiations on the basis of Article 7 of the Triple Alliance, which stipulated that Italy should receive compensation in the event of Austrian expansion in the Balkans. Austria was plainly disinclined to accept the principle of the cession of her Italian territories, and hence negotiations were begun with the Triple Entente. While Austria was at last belatedly deciding upon the cession of certain territories—but the cession was very much less than was demanded by Italy, and would have been postponed until the end of the war—the Italian government concluded the Pact of London (26 April 1915) with the Entente, and denounced (3 May) the Triple Alliance. While this was being done in diplomatic secrecy, the neutralistic party found support in the attitude of Giolitti, who still had the backing of the majority of the Chamber, and who was inclined to consider the new and increased offer of Austria; hence the resignations from the Salandra ministry (13 May). There were then colossal popular demonstrations in favour of intervention (the

"Days of May"), the king reconfirmed Salandra's premiership (16 May), and Parliament (20 May) conferred upon him plenary powers for the conduct of the war. War was declared on Austria on the 23 May, and on the 24th Italy entered the war. (Declarations of war upon Turkey and Germany followed later.) The Salandra administration was followed, and the war was continued, by the ministries of Boselli (National Coalition, 1916-1917) and Orlando (1917-1918).

Notwithstanding the numerical superiority of the Italian over the Austrian army, which was involved in war upon other fronts, the war had to be fought by Italy under very difficult conditions, owing to the unfavourable military frontier inherited from 1866. On the very long arc between the Stelvio and the Adriatic, which was in serious danger of collapse, the Italian troops could advance only very slowly against an enemy who held strongly fortified positions in the Alps and on the hills of the Carso. As in France, the war became a war of trenches, but under worse conditions, which were aggravated by the initial inferiority of the Italian armaments. However, the Italian army slowly advanced through the Carso, drawing upon itself an ever-increasing force of Austrians. Its function became one of capital importance when the Russian resistance to the Central Empires was wiped out by the revolutions of March and November 1917. After the occupation of the high plateau of the Bainsizza (August 1917) it appeared that Trieste was threatened, and the German high command decided to intervene. Together with the Austrians, on the 23 October 1917 they opened the offensive of Caporetto on the Upper Isonzo. The Italian front was driven in on the flank of the Third Army, which was holding the line of the Carso, and then, since a defensive line had not been sufficiently prepared immediately in the rear, the whole Italian army had to retreat, during the first days of November, to the line of the plateau extending from the Grappa to the Piave. There, notwithstanding the heavy casualties suffered, it held on tenaciously to its new positions and offered a completely successful resistance to the renewed enemy attacks, even before the arrival of reinforcements in the shape of a few French and English divisions (as afterwards a few Italian divisions were sent to France). The high command in this new phase was held by General

Armando Diaz, who was far more successful than Cadorna in winning the regard of the troops and keeping up their morale. Throughout the whole of Italy public opinion, which had hitherto been very largely undecided and conflicting, was firmly united in the determination to resist and to conquer. In June 1918 (15-22) a great Austrian offensive on the Piave was completely defeated. In October a general offensive was decided upon, directed to breaking the Austrian front at the junction between the Alpine sector and that of the Piave. It was opened on October 24. The Austrian front was shattered, and the two sections were enveloped, with enormous captures of men and material. In the last days of October and the first of November all the lost territory was recovered, and also the Trentino. The Austrian high command sued for an armistice, which was signed at Villa Giusti near Padua, on the 3 November, taking effect on the 4th. The southern frontier of Germany was now uncovered. Even before the middle of October those peoples of the twofold monarchy who were neither Hungarian nor German had risen in irresistible rebellion, which led to the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian State, and had its repercussions in the army. In vain did the Emperor Charles proclaim (16 October) the federal transformation of the Empire. Czechs, Jugoslavs, Rumanians, Poles, and finally Germans and Magyars proceeded to the constitution of separate states, while in Trieste the union of the city with Italy was proclaimed.

Before the Austrian front had given way the Bulgarian and Turkish defence had crumbled, while the German front, under the pressure of French, British and Americans (since in 1917 the United States had entered the war, provoked by the "unlimited warfare" of the German submarines), had been constantly retreating since the second half of July, without hope of recovery. The German government opened negotiations with the United States, the revolution broke out in Germany, all the German sovereigns disappeared, and on the 11 November the Provisional Government signed the Armistice. In the Conference of Paris the victorious powers laid down the conditions of peace, which was concluded with Germany by the Treaty of Versailles (28 June 1919) and with Austria and Hungary by the Treaty of Saint Germain (10 September 1919) and the Treaty

of the Trianon (4 June 1920). By the Peace Treaties was constituted the League of Nations, which, one by one, even the conquered nations joined.

In the case of Italy it was particularly difficult to arrive at a settlement after the war. The situation was complicated by two facts: the opposition of the new State of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (afterwards known as Yugoslavia)—supported more or less by France and Great Britain, and above all by President Wilson—to the application of the Treaty of London; and the problem of Fiume, which according to this treaty should have gone to the Croats, while the city demanded union with Italy. While the matter was being discussed by the diplomatists, Gabriele D'Annunzio (§ 124), who had been one of the leaders of Interventionism, and had done brilliant service in the war as an aviator, occupied Fiume at the head of a body of volunteers (12 September 1919), and assumed the government of the city. At the same time the Dalmatian question was brought into prominence by the Nationalist party. In the end, after prolonged and complicated negotiations, the last Giolitti ministry (with Sforza at the Foreign Office) concluded with Yugoslavia the Treaty of Rapallo (12 November 1920). The eastern Alpine frontier, with the whole of Istria, was recognized as Italian, as the frontier of the Brenner had been recognized in the treaty with Austria. The Dalmatian zone, attributed by the Treaty of London to Italy, was awarded to Yugoslavia, with the exception of Zara, the principal Italian centre, which was united with Italy. Fiume, with a small surrounding area, was constituted a free city, contiguous to Italy and Yugoslavia. In 1923 the city of Fiume, in accordance with a new treaty with Yugoslavia, was united with Italy.

§ 127. FASCISM.—The war produced violent economic, political and moral upheavals of which Europe is still feeling the effects. There were extraordinary changes of fortune; monetary devaluation enriched some and impoverished others; the passage from a war to a peace economy was attended with very serious difficulties; there was social unrest in the proletariat and (often for contrary reasons) in the lower middle classes; there were great transformations of sentiments and

ideas. Immediately after the war the formation of the communistic Soviet Republic in Russia exercised a very great influence on the working-class masses of Europe, and the proletarian movements were everywhere diverted towards the extreme Left. This was the so-called period of Bolshevization. The influence of Russia began to decline after the Russians were defeated by the Poles in the summer of 1920, and after the world had begun to learn something of the deplorable economic conditions and the harshly autocratic government of the new Russia.

In Italy especially the post-war period was a period of general disturbance. The disorder and perturbation, analogous to those occurring in other countries, were exaggerated by the weakness of the Nitti government (1919-1920); by the predominance in the Socialist party of the extremist elements, while the opposing movements were becoming more combative; by the polemics in respect of the results of the war, and by the increasing difficulties of Parliamentary government. After the elections of November 1919—on a basis of universal suffrage and proportional representation, in accordance with the new regulations voted by the war Parliament before it dissolved—there were two great parties in the Chamber, which accounted for about half the numbers: the Socialist party and the Popular (that is, the Catholic) party. The Socialists, incapable of bringing about a revolution, took refuge in intransigence, refusing to collaborate with the government; the Popular party collaborated with the government, but was torn by internal dissensions. There was an epidemic of strikes and working-class disturbances, and even a temporary occupation of the factories by the workers (September 1920); and with this was combined a certain revival of neutralistic passions and resentments, giving rise to incidents no less offensive to the sense of civic discipline than to patriotic feeling. After the prompt and peaceful termination of the workers' occupation of the factories the Bolshevizing movement in the ranks of the proletariat began to decline, and at the beginning of 1920 there was a split between the Communists and the Socialists (the latter being in the great majority). There was an increase of governmental control under the last Giolitti ministry (June 1920—June 1921) which did something in the way of preserving

order and restoring the finances; but it resigned after the new general election, which did not bring about any substantial changes. Giolitti's successors, Bononi and Facta, were able to control neither the Parliamentary situation nor the conflicts in the provinces.

Meanwhile, in the provinces, the Fascist movement had been developing, created (in Milan, 23 March 1919) and led by Benito Mussolini (§ 125), an exceptionally gifted and inspiring organizer. Various movements and tendencies went to its formation, but all were dominated by his personality; the nationalistic movement, recruited by the polemics respecting the results of the war; the reaction of the bourgeoisie, especially in agricultural Emilia, against the insolence of the Socialists; the aspirations and anxieties of the lower middle class, disturbed and unbalanced by the war spirit. The Fascist movement made extensive and successful use of "direct action" against the strongest positions of the Socialists, developing the tactics of *squadristmo*. It distinguished itself especially on the occasion of the general strike attempted by the Socialist party at the end of July 1922.

On the 27 October 1922 Benito Mussolini organized the general mobilization of the Fascists, and the "march on Rome," which took place on the 28th. The second Facta ministry, which had already sent in its resignation, wished to attempt resistance by proclaiming the state of siege; King Victor Emmanuel III rejected the government's advice and sent for Mussolini, who immediately constituted a new government, appealing even to men of the old parties, but without negotiating with the parties themselves. With that the work of re-organizing and transforming the State began; among the earliest measures was the creation of the Volunteer Militia for National Security, which absorbed the Fascist *squadristmo*. The Chamber elected in April 1924, on the basis of a new electoral law, contained a very large majority of government supporters, though not all the members of this majority were as yet Fascists. The opposition minorities (a group of Democrats, the greater part of the Popular party, Republicans and Socialists) withdrawing from the chamber after the murder of the Socialist deputy Matteotti (June), entered, in the second half of 1924, upon an open campaign against the government

(the so-called "Aventino"). But the Aventino did not carry the country with it, nor did the small oppositional group in the Chamber, led by Giolitti—who had hitherto supported the government—have any success in Parliament. On the 3 January 1925 Mussolini, addressing the Chamber, defied the Aventinist opposition (which was still absenting itself from Parliament) and announced the definitive transition from the Liberal to the Fascist regime. Between 1925 and 1926 the oppositions were completely demolished; and all parties save the Fascist having been dissolved, measures were taken and organs created to repress all political agitation, the political Press was subjected to the discipline of the Fascist regime, the representation of the workers was confided to the Fascist syndicates (the Socialist and Catholic confederations being dissolved), and Mussolini proceeded to the systematic construction of the new State.

This State has been defined by him as an "authoritarian democracy," and it is also known as "totalitarian." That is to say, it is a State in which the government is sovereign, and power diminishes progressively from the top to the bottom, but a State which intends to interpret the will of the people and satisfy its needs, receiving the approbation of the citizens by means of periodical votes. The government exercises the completest possible control of the whole of the nation's life. Intermediate between the Fascist government and the people is the National Fascist Party, which does not represent a political movement in conflict with others (which are no longer permitted), but an organization in the service of the Fascist State, from which the officials of the State are exclusively recruited.

The head of the State is the king, the State being monarchical in form, and the Savoyard dynasty being accepted by Fascism. The "Head of the Government," nominated by the king, is the Duce, by which name Benito Mussolini is known abroad as well as in Italy. The Head exercises the supreme control of all the government's activities; immediately under him are various government services of special importance, and he issues directions for the other services to the various ministers, who are nominated by the king at the Duce's suggestion, and are drawn from the ranks of the party. At the Duce's side is a consultative organ, the Grand Fascist Council, constituted



in January 1923, and whose competences were determined subsequently. It is composed of ministers and other high officers of the party. The whole of the government's activities are dependent upon the initiative and the decisions of Mussolini in person. The government, as well as the executive power, exerts the legislative power in cases of special urgency, by means of legislative decrees which are afterwards ratified by Parliament.

The ordinary legislative power is still exercised by the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies. No changes have been made in the Senate, the Chamber has been reduced to 400 members, and its constitution has been transformed. The syndical organizations and other national associations propose various groups of eligible candidates, and the final choice is made by the Grand Fascist Council. The people thereupon vote for a single list of candidates for the whole of Italy. The Chamber of Deputies will finally be transformed into the Chamber of the Fasci and Corporations. Still more radical has been the transformation of the local administrations, the municipal and provincial councils and their elective heads being replaced by *podestà* and consultative organs nominated by the government.

The Fascist state is known also as the "Corporative State." By the "Charter of Labour" (21 April 1927) Labour as a social activity was proclaimed the foundation of civic activity. Workers and employers of labour are organized in the Fascist Syndicates, and these are combined in Confederations, both being organs of the State, controlled by the government. This syndical organization draws up collective labour contracts, which are general and obligatory in all branches of labour; strikes and lockouts are prohibited, and disputes between employers and workers are settled by special labour magistrates. There have been important developments in social politics, such as workers' pensions, the 40 hour week, the "Dopolavoro," etc. While the syndical organization regulates the relations between the various classes co-operating in production, this latter is regulated in accordance with the general interest of the nation by the Corporations, whose constitution was initiated in December 1933, and in which are associated, in the case of the great branches of production, the representatives of the various classes of producers. The system is that of "regulated

economy," regulated in accordance with the interests of the State. Of recent years the "autarchic" tendency has been accentuated, with a view to producing within the country the greatest possible number of products essential to economic life, and above all, to the warlike efficiency of the nation. The government controls the currency, exchange, and all foreign trade.

A tremendous policy of public works endeavours to augment the production and the economic machinery of the nation. Particular attention has been given to agriculture; by the "battle of the grain" (cereals campaign) the soil of Italy has been made to produce all, or nearly all, the corn needed for consumption. By the law of "integral improvement" a radical solution has been found for the problem of reclamation and exploitation of uncultivated or marshy land. This impressive undertaking has justified itself most conspicuously in the Pontine Marshes, when the new centres of Littoria, Sabaudia, Pontinia and Aprilia have arisen, and where the new province of Littoria has been constituted. This solicitude for agriculture is related to the solicitude for the demographic development of the nation. In this connection the "Opera Nazionale per la Maternità e Infanzia" calls for special mention. The population of the kingdom is constantly increasing and now exceeds 43 millions. Rome, Naples and Milan contain each more than a million inhabitants. Important public buildings have been erected in many cities, in accordance with a systematic plan; in Rome imposing archaeological excavations have been undertaken, uncovering the forums of the Empire, and the Via dell' Impero has been constructed.

The Fascist regime has given much thought to its relation to the Catholic religion, making this one of the elements of the regime. The fact of greatest importance in this connection consists of the Pacts of the Lateran (11 February 1929), concluded with Pope Pius XI (Ratti, elected in 1922 as successor to Benedict XV, Della Chiesa, elected in 1914). The "Roman question" was solved by a treaty by the terms of which the Holy See possesses the "Vatican City" in full sovereignty, while the Holy See recognizes the kingdom of Italy. By a Concordat the relations between Church and State in Italy are established, religious instruction being introduced in the middle

schools, while religious matrimony has the validity of civil marriage.

Above all, the Fascist regime has fostered the military strength of the nation, renewing and developing the plant of the armament industries, creating a very strong air force and developing the physical education and military preparedness of the whole nation. This work has been undertaken, under the direction of the Ministry of National Education, by the "Opera Nazionale Balilla," now transformed into "Gioventù italiana del Littorio," directly dependent upon the Fascist Party, from which the young members pass into the Party itself at the age of 18 as "Giovani Fascisti."

The activity of the regime has been intense in the domain of international politics. Italy was a party to the Treaty of Locarno (16 October 1925), by which she guaranteed, in conjunction with England, the pledge taken by Germany, France and Belgium to respect one another's territorial integrity. In Paris (27 August 1928) Italy signed the Kellogg Pact, by which all the States of the world declared that they renounced war as an instrument of national policy; a solemn manifestation, unaccompanied, however, by practical sanctions. The Fascist government played an active part in the negotiations for the reduction of armaments, some of which were carried on within the framework of the League of Nations. While the Treaties of Washington (1922) and London (1930), together with other subsequent stipulations, succeeded in establishing the standards of limitation to be observed by the Great Powers in respect of naval armaments, the Disarmament Conference assembled in Geneva in February 1932 was able to achieve nothing. The chief obstacle was the new armaments policy of Germany, who refused to be bound any longer by the clauses of the Versailles Treaty. The new National Socialist government of Hitler proceeded to re-arm on a large scale, withdrawing (October 1933) from the Disarmament Conference, and from the League of Nations, re-establishing (March 1933) the military air force and compulsory service, denouncing (7 March 1936) the Treaty of Locarno, and marching troops into the zone of the Rhine, which was demilitarized by the Treaty of Versailles. At the beginning of 1935 there was a moment of close understanding between Italy, France and Great Britain. The two principal mani-

festations were the Franco-Italian agreements concluded in Rome (7 January 1935) between Mussolini and the French Foreign Minister, Laval, both being anxious to safeguard the independence of Austria against National Socialist annexation, and to promote good relations between the various Danubian states (they also took steps for the liquidation of various colonial questions pending between France and Italy); and the Italo-Franco-British Conference of Stresa (April 1935), over which Mussolini presided, at which were discussed various common policies in respect of the fundamental problems of European politics.

This entente was destroyed by the Ethiopian question. In 1935 the Head of the Fascist Government applied himself to solving this question by armed force, obtaining for Italy a great colonial empire. The League of Nations, of which Abyssinia had been a member since 1923, opposed the Italian enterprise, which was declared to be aggressive, and established economic sanctions, which did not check the military activities of Italy. The war, opened on the Tigre and Somali fronts at the beginning of October 1935, terminated in the victory of the Italian arms under the command of Marshal Badoglio, and the occupation of Addis Ababa on the 5 May 1936. On the 9 May Victor Emmanuel III assumed the title of Emperor of Ethiopia. The League of Nations abrogated the sanctions in July, without recognizing the new state of affairs. The Fascist government absented itself from the sessions of the League, and entered into a close understanding with Germany (the "Rome-Berlin Axis"). With Germany and Japan, on the 6 November 1937, she signed a pact against the Communist International, and on the 11 December she announced her withdrawal from the League of Nations. In this entirely different international situation the agreements of Rome and Stresa lapsed (as we have seen), and in March 1938 Austria was annexed to Germany.

The close solidarity between Fascist Italy and National-Socialist Germany was manifested—apart from Mussolini's visit to Germany (September 1937) and Hitler's to Italy (May 1938)—by the moral and material support given by the two powers to General Franco in Spain, when he rebelled (July 1936) against the Republican government of the "Popular Front," becoming, in the course of the Civil

War, the military ruler of the country, in which he will introduce a regime akin to Fascism and National Socialism. From Italy mainly went the tens of thousands of "legionaries" who contributed so essentially to Franco's victories. This activity in favour of Franco counterbalanced the activity of Soviet Russia and the internationalist actions of the extreme Left, especially the French. The attitude adopted by the French government was favourable to Republican Spain, and there were moments when it seemed that the peace of Europe was threatened by the Spanish question; but the peril was avoided, thanks to the mutual agreement of the powers to observe a policy of "non-intervention."

Another and a more serious international crisis occurred in September 1938, in connection with the problem of the Sudeten Germans in Czechoslovakia, as Germany demanded their union with the Reich, invoking the principle of self-determination. France declared her intention of supporting Czechoslovakia against attack, and Great Britain was plainly inclined to take her stand beside France; while the Fascist government announced that in the event of a European conflagration it would side with Germany. However, since the two Western powers persuaded the Czechoslovak government to accept the principle of cession in respect of the areas in question, the cession itself was finally arranged—on the eve of Germany's armed entry into Czechoslovakian territory—at the conference of Munich (29 September), which was held, as a result of Mussolini's initiative, between the heads of the governments of the four powers. Shortly afterwards (November) an important Anglo-Italian agreement, concluded in April, was put into force; on the other hand, the agreements concluded with France in January 1935 were terminated (December) by the Italian Government.

The Fascist government, associating its domestic policy with its innovating activity in foreign policy, issued in the autumn of 1938, in the name of the defence of the Italian race, radical anti-Semitic measures, by which Hebrew aliens who had established themselves in Italy since the war were to be expelled, while the political and civil rights of the Italian Hebrews would be substantially reduced. Finally, in December 1938 the replacement (already mentioned) of the Chamber

of Deputies by the Chamber of the Fasci and Corporations, the direct emanation of the Fascist government, became a legal fact: a constitutional change by which, with the disappearance of the last relic of the liberal and democratic electoral system, the fabric of the authoritarian and totalitarian State was finally crowned.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

N.B.—The indications which follow are only a scanty selection. Besides the classical and fundamental authorities the works indicated are for the most part comparatively recent studies, which themselves contain references to older works which are also worth consultation.

Of compendia of the history of Italy, after the classic *Sommario della Storia d'Italia* of CESARE BALBO (pub. Nicolini in the "Scrittori d'Italia" by Laterza) still useful for its ideas and its data—we cannot do better than recommend L. M. HARTMANN, *Compendio della Storia d'Italia da Romolo a Vittorio Emanuele II* (Ital. tr. Florence, 1927) which, notwithstanding its title, contains references to prehistory and pre-Roman Italy. It is very compendious in its exposition of the facts, and to be recommended for its exposition of certain politico-economic developments of the Late Empire and the Middle Ages. There is a general history of Italy which has only recently become widely known; A. ORIANI, *La lotta politica in Italia*, 3 vols. down to 1887 (last ed. Bologna, 1925); but it deals very briefly with the period preceding the Risorgimento (Vol. II begins with 1821), is of little use to the student, and derives largely from Ferrari.

F. Vallardi of Milan has published two "Storie d'Italia," different periods being treated by various authors; the first appearing about 1880, the second after 1900. The volumes which may usefully be consulted will be cited later.

The great foreign compendia of general history usually contain a very parsimonious treatment of the history of mediaeval and modern Italy. The collection "Peuples et Civilizations," ed. by L. Halphen and Ph. Sagnac (Alcan), may be mentioned, and the *Histoire générale* begun under the editorship of G. Glotz (Presses universitaires de France), the first now complete, the second in the course of publication, both rich in bibliographical references.

Of bibliographical value are the references in the reviews "Historisches Zeitschrift," "Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique" (a systematic bibliography, useful also for secular history), "Revue historique" (which publishes bulletins for the various periods of Italian history), "Rivista storica italiana." The short bibliographical notes in the "Archivio storico italiano" are also useful. A very full bibliography, contributed by F. CHABOD, will be found at the end of the article *Italia, Storia*, of the *Enciclopedia italiana* (1933). Also the "Guide bibliografiche" of the Fondazione Leonardo: P. EGIDI, *La storia medioevale* (1922); F. LEMMI, *Il Risorgimento* (1926).



FROM PREHISTORIC TIMES TO THE  
ROMAN CONQUEST

§ 1.—F. SACCO, *La formazione geologica dell'Italia*, 1919; G. MARINELLI, *La Terra*, IV: *Italia*, p. 1 (Milan, Vallardi); *Terre e Nazioni. L'Italia. Caratteristiche generali*, by A. MORI (Vallardi, 1936).

§§ 2–3.—Art. *Italia*, in the *Real-Enklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* of Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, Supplement III (1918), contr. by PHILIPP & LACKEIT; art. *Italien* in the *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte* of M. Ebert, VI (1926), contr. by F. V. DUHN; O. MONTELIUS, *La civilisation primitive en Italie depuis l'introduction des métaux* (Stockholm, 1895–1910), 4 vols. dealing only with Northern and Central Italy; P. DUCATI, *L'Italia antica* (Milan, 1936: vol. I of the "Storia d'Italia" Mondadori), c. 1–111 (with detailed bibliography). Shorter, but giving more attention to ethnic history, G. DE SANCTIS, *Storia dei Romani*, I (Turin, 1907). The same may be said of L. HOMO, *L'Italie primitive et les débuts de l'impérialisme romain* (Paris, 1925). Further, for the geography, anthropology and topography of ancient Italy H. NISSEN, *Italische Landeskunde*, 3 vols. (1883–1902, Berlin).

For individual peoples: G. SERGI, *Origine e diffusione della stirpe mediterranea* (Rome, 1895) is the fundamental work on the subject; W. HELBIG, *Die Italiker in der Poebene* (Leipzig, 1879); C. PAULY, *Altitalische Forschungen*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1885–1895); G. DEVOTO, *Gli antichi Italici* (Florence, 1931); G. KOERTE, art. *Etrusker* in the *Real-Enc.* Pauly-Wissowa cited VI; L. PARETI, *Le origini etrusche* (Florence, 1926); P. DUCATI, *Etruria antica*, 2 vols. (Turin, 1927, 2nd ed.); A. SOLARI, *Vita pubblica e privata degli Etruschi* (Florence, 1931); E. PAIS, *Storia dell'Italia antica e della Sicilia per l'età anteriore al dominio romano*, I (Turin, 1933), above all for the Greek colonization; E. CIACERI, *Storia della Magna Grecia*, 3 vols. (Milan, 1924–1927); C. CONTENAU, *La civilisation phénicienne* (Paris, 1926); O. MELTZER and U. KAHRSTEDT, *Geschichte der Karthager*, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1913).

§ 4.—See the bibliography of §§ 2–3 for individual peoples. Also DE SANCTIS, and DUCATI. A. ROSENBERG, *Der Staat der alten Italiker* (Berlin, 1913). On the early ages of Rome see the histories of Ancient Rome, of which, after MOMMSEN's classic, the *Storia dei Romani* of G. DE SANCTIS should be mentioned, of which 4 volumes have been published (down to 168); and also the successive versions of E. PAIS, now condensed in the work cited in §§ 2–3. For this first period see: A. PIGANIOU, *La conquête romaine* (Paris, 1927), in the Alcan collection; E. PAIS, *Storia critica di Roma durante i primi 5 secoli*, vol. 4 (Rome, 1913–1920); A. PIGANIOU, *Essai sur les origines de Rome* (Paris, 1917); B. MODESTOV, *Introduction a l'Histoire romaine* (Paris, 1907). For the whole of Roman history

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

a good manual is that of B. NIESE, *Römische Geschichte* (Munich, 1923, 5 ed.) Ital. tr. Milan, 1910.

§ 5.—The histories of Rome cited in § 4. For the Roman institutions to the end of the Empire see the very full and minutely documented *Handbuch der römischen Altertümer* of TH. MOMMSEN and J. MARQUARDT, vol. 7 (Leipzig, 1881–1887, 3rd ed.), of which there is a French translation *Manuel des antiquités romaines* (Paris, 1887–1907), a work which is still of fundamental importance. For the history of Roman law see the manual of the same name by P. BONFANTE. For the creation of the Republic G. PACCHIONI, *Dalla monarchia alla repubblica* (in "Atti dell'Accademia di Torino," 60, 1925). For internal conflicts: OBERZINER, *Patriziato e plebe nello svolgimento delle origini romane* (Milan, 1912); H. J. ROSE, *Patricians and Plebeians of Rome* (in "Journal of Roman Studies," 12, 1922); E. MEYER, *Ursprung des Tribunats* (in "Hermes," 30, 1895). For the economic aspect of the internal conflicts and for the economic history of Rome in general to the end of the Republic a fundamental work is T. FRANK, *An economic history of Rome* (London, 1927, 2nd ed.).

§§ 6–7.—Besides the works cited for the history of Rome see J. BELOCH, *Römische Geschichte* (Berlin, 1926); T. FRANK, *On Rome's conquest of Sabinum, Picenum and Etruria* (in "Klio," 11, 1911). A general sketch of the conquest and Romanization of Italy is given by C. CARDINALI (in "Historia," 6, 1932, p. 181).

For the Gauls, C. JULLIAN, *Histoire de la Gaule*, 8 vols. (3rd ed., Paris, 1920 ff); A. GRENIER, *Les Gaulois*, a good compendium in the Payot collection. For the Campani: J. BELOCH, *Campanien* (Breslau, 1890, 2nd ed.). For the Sanniti: art. *Samniter* by PHILIPP in *Real-Enc.* Pauly-Wissowa, I, A., 2.

§ 8.—Besides the MOMMSEN-MARQUARDT manual and the histories of Rome (including that of BELOCH, cited in prec.) see: J. BELOCH, *Der Italische Bund unter Roms Hegemonie* (Leipzig, 1880), and the very recent and fundamental study by H. RUDOLPH, *Stadt und Staat im römischen Italien* (Leipzig, 1935), whose theses, however, should be regarded with caution. For the Roman colonies see E. DE RUGGIERO, art. *Colonia*, in the *Dizionario epigrafico d'antichità romane* II, 1, and separately, *Le col. di R.* (Spoleto, 1897); and E. GORNEMANN, art. *Coloniae* in the *Real-Enc.* cited, IV, 1.

## CHAPTER II

### ROMAN ITALY TO THE FALL OF THE EMPIRE

§ 9.—E. PAIS, *Storia di Roma durante le guerre puniche*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1927); *Ibid.*, *Storia di Roma durante le grandi conquiste mediterranee* (Turin, 1931); A. ARENDT, *Syrakus im zweiten punischen Krieg*, 2 vols. (Königsberg, 1899–1905); E. PAIS, *Storia della Sardegna e della Corsica durante il periodo romano* (Rome,

1923); A. LAUTERBACH, *Untersuchung zur Geschichte der Unterwerfung von Ober-Italien durch die Römer* (Breslau, 1905); R. SCALAIS, *La propriété agricole et pastorale de la Sicile depuis la conquête romaine jusqu'aux guerres serviles* (in "Musée Belge," 29, 1925).

§ 10.—For economic conditions in general, besides FRANK (§ 5) see W. HEITLAND, *Agricola* (Cambridge, 1921); G. SALVIOLI, *Il capitalismo nel mondo antico* (Bari, 1929, 2nd ed.); G. KROMAYER, *Die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung Italiens im II und I Jahrhundert v. C.* (in "Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum," 17, 1914); R. SCALAIS, *La production agricole dans l'Etat romain et les importations des blés provinciaux jusqu'à la deuxième guerre punique* (in "Musée Belge," 1925).

For Roman literature the fundamental work to consult is M. SCHANZ, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*, 5 vols., being gradually republished (Munich, in the *Handbuch* of Ivan von Müller). Accounts which make easy reading are those of R. PICHON, *Histoire de la littérature latine* (Paris, 1921), and (fuller) V. USSANI, *Storia della letteratura latina nell'età repubblicana e augustea* (Milan, 1929).

For Roman religion: G. WISSOWA, *Religion und Kultus der Römer* (Berlin, 1912, 2nd ed.); F. ALTHEIM, *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1932).

§ 11.—For the general economic conditions the same works as in § 10. For the Servile Wars: RATHKE, *De Romanorum bellis servilibus* (Berlin, 1909). For the Gracchi: J. CARCOPINO, *Autour des Gracques* (Paris, 1928); G. CARDINALI, *Studi graccani* (in "Atti della Regia Università di Genova," XX, 1912); G. CORRADI, *C. Gracco e le sue leggi* (in "Studi italiani di filologia classica," N.S., 5-6, 1928); A. PIGANIOL, *L'œuvre des Gracques* (in "Annales d'Histoire économique et sociale," 1929).

§ 12.—K. W. DRUMANN and O. GROEBE, *Geschichte Roms in seinem Uebergang von der republikanischen zur monarchischen Verfassung*, 4 vols. (Berlin, 1929); G. FERRERO, *Grandezza e decadenza di Rome*, 5 vols. (Milan, 1902-1907). For Silla: M. A. LEVI, *Silla, Saggio sulla storia politica di Roma dall'88 all'80 a. C.* (Milan, 1921). For the municipal transformation of Italy see Rudolph § 8.

§ 13.—DRUMANN-GROEBE and FERRERO. 12. An important contribution is CARCOPINO's in the *Histoire générale* of Glotz (initial bibl.), *Histoire romaine*, II, 2. Also: E. CIACERI, *Cicerone e i suoi tempi*, 2 vols. (Milan, 1926-1930); M. MAFFII, *Cicerone e il suo dramma politico* (Milan, 1935), a serious if diffuse treatment; L. PARETI, *Alle soglie dell'impero. La congiura di Catilina* (Catania, 1935); art. *Julius Caesar* by KLOTZ in the *Real-Enc.* Pauly-Wissowa, X, 1; M. GELZER, *Caesar der Politiker und Staatsmann* (Stuttgart, 1921); V. GARDTHAUSEN, *Augustus und seine Zeit*, 6 vols. (Leipzig, 1896-1899); T. R. HOLMES, *The Architect of Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1928). Also for Augustus the literature at the beginning of 14.—Conquest and Romanization of the Alpine valleys: E. PAIS, *Dalle guerre puniche a Cesare Augusto*, II (Rome, 1918). The Augustan regions: TH. MOMMSEN, *Die Italischen Regionen* (in *Gesammelte Schriften*, V).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

For the Roman literature of this period see the works cited in § 10. For the cultural atmosphere at the close of the Republic: G. BOISSIER, *Cicéron et ses amis* (Paris, 1910); M. GELZER, *Die römische Gesellschaft zur Zeit Ciceros* (in "Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum," 23, 1920).

§ 14—Histories of the Roman Empire: H. SCHILLER, *Geschichte der römische Kaiserzeit*, 2 vols. (Gotha, 1883–1887); A. VON DOMASZEWSKI, *Gesch. der röm. Kaiser* (Leipzig, 1909); H. DESSAU, *Gesch. der röm. Kaiserzeit* (Berlin, 1924); E. ALBERTINI, *L'empire romain* (Paris, 1929), in the Alcan collection; L. HOMO, *L'empire romain* (Paris, 1925). For the organization of the Empire, besides MOMMSEN-MARQUARDT (§ 5): O. HIRSCHFELD, *Die kaiserliche Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diokletian* (Berlin, 1905). For the municipal administration in particular: F. F. ABBOTT and A. CH. JOHNSON, *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire* (Princeton, 1926). There is no systematic and extended reconstruction of the Italian politico-administrative conditions under the Empire, and their evolution. For the economic conditions of the Imperial period: M. ROSTOVZEV, *Economic and Social History of the Roman Empire*: a fundamental work, most useful for the comprehension of the political history, which includes the whole of the 3rd century. For the literature of the Imperial period, besides SCHANZ, see N. TERZAGHI, *Storia della letteratura latina da Tiberio a Giustiniano* (Milan, 1934). For the recruiting of the army: TH. MOMMSEN, *Die Conscriptionssordnung der röm. Kaiserzeit* (in *Ges. Schr.*, VI) and ROSTOVZEV, p. 48, n. 1; and for the elimination of the Italians from the army, *ibid.* 100 and n.

§ 15.—For the political conditions of the 3rd century it will be best to read the brief treatise by ROSTOVZEV, chaps. IX–XI, which is, however, the fundamental economic treatise. For the period from Diocletian inclusive, see also Chap. XII; the most specific of more recent works is E. STEIN, *Gesch. des spätromischen Reiches*, I, 305–476 (Vienna, 1928); the fullest, O. SEECK, *Gesch. des Untergangs der antiken Welt*, 6 vols. (Berlin, 1897–1921). Including the period 395–476: J. B. BURY, *History of the later Roman Empire from the Death of Theodosius to the Death of Justinian*, 2 vols. (London, 1925); G. ROMANO, *Le dominazioni barbariche in Italia* (Milan, in the second Vallardi collection). From 395 onwards, the classic *Storia della città di Roma nel Medio Evo* di G. GREVOROVIVS (last reprinting of Ital. tr., Turin, 1925–1926), 8 vols. which comes down to 1534. It has the character of a general history, and always makes instructive and most entertaining reading (the notes are useful to students). On the politico-administrative organization of Italy in the Late Empire: MOMMSEN, *Ostgothische Studien* (in *Ges. Schr.*, VI); G. B. PICOTTI, *Il "Patricius" nell'ultima età imperiale e nei primi regni barbarici in Italia* (in "Archivio storico italiano," 86, 1928). For the conditions of the cities and for reference to the classic work (but old: 1847) of C. HEGEL, *Gesch. der Stadtverfassung von Italien*, I (Ital. tr., Milan, 1861). For religious and ecclesiastical conditions: L. DUCHESNE, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, III (Paris, 1910); H. GRISAR, *Roma alla fine del mondo antico*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1930) (the German original pub., 1898); F. LANZONI, *Le diocesi d'Italia dalle origine al principio del secolo VII*, 2 vols. in *Studi e testi* (Faenza, 1927). For the history

of the Papacy, besides GRISAR: E. CASPAR, *Gesch. des Papsttums*, 2 vols. (Tübingen, 1930-1933), which comes down to the middle of the 8th century. For the Christian literature, besides vols. IV and V of SCHANZ: O. BARDENHEWER, *Gesch. der altkirchlichen Literatur*, 5 vols. (Freiburg im Br. 1913-1932); and more compendious, but with detailed references as to the content of works, and with bibliographical data later than Schanz and Bardenhewer, L. SALVATORELLI, *Storia della letteratura latina cristiana dalle origini alla meta del VI secolo* (Milan, 1936).

### CHAPTER III

## OSTROGOTHS AND BYZANTINES

§ 16.—For the Early Middle Ages in Italy the fundamental works are ROMANO (§ 15), who comes down to 1024, and still better L. M. HARTMANN, *Gesch. Italiens im Mittelalter*, interrupted at Hardouin in vol. IV, 1 (Gotha-Stuttgart, 1897-1915; of the 1st vol. 2nd ed. 1923). In the course of publication in the "Storia d'Italia Mondadori": L. SALVATORELLI, *L'Italia medioevale* (down to the death of Otto III).

For Odoacer: GAUDENZI, *Sui rapporti fra l'Italia e l'impero d'Oriente fra gli anni 476 and 554* (Bologna, 1888); R. CESSI, "Regnum" ed "imperium" in Italia: contributo alla storia della costituzione politica d'Italia dalla caduta alla ricostituzione dell'impero d'Occidente, I (Bologna, 1929). See also MOMMSEN, § 15.

§§ 17-18.—See § 16. Also: L. SALVATORELLI, *S. Benedetto e l'Italia del suo tempo* (Bari, 1929). Economic conditions: G. SALVIOLI, *L'Italia agricola nelle lettere di Cassiodoro*, in *Miscellanea Schipa*, 1926. Ecclesiastical politics: PFEILSCHIFTER, *Des Ostgotenkönig Theoderich der Grosse und die kath. Kirche* (Munster, 1896); R. VESSI, *Lo scisma laurenziano alla pacificazione religiosa dell'Oriente* (ibid., 43, 1920). For the culture of the Gothic period see the literary histories cited in § 15 with the relevant bibliography.

§ 19.—CH. DIEHL, *Justinien et la civilisation byzantine au VI siècle* (Paris, 1901); W. G. HOLMES, *The age of Justinian and Theodora*, 2 vols. (London, 1906-1907); P. BATIFFOL, *L'empereur Justinien et le siège apostolique* (in "Recherches de sciences religieuses," 16, 1926), general sketch; P. HILDEBRAND, *Die Absetzung des Papstes Silverius* (Munich, 1924).

§ 20.—CH. DIEHL, *Etude sur l'administration byzantine dans l'Exarchat de Ravenne* (Paris, 1888); L. M. HARTMANN *Untersuchungen zur Gesch. der byz. Verwaltung in Italien* (Leipzig, 1889); S. MOCHI ONORY, *Ricerche sui poteri civili dei vescovi nelle città umbre durante l'alto Medio Evo* (Rome, 1907).

§ 21.—Of the schism of the Three Chapters, notwithstanding the great importance of the episode for the Italian history of the time, there is still no adequate treatment. The best is that of DUCHESNE in *L'Eglise au VI siècle* (Paris,

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1925).—A short history of the *Patriarcato* (of Aquileia) in the miscellany *La Basilica di Aquileia* (Bologna, 1933).

For St. Benedict: SALVATORELLI (§§ 17–18); J. CHAPMAN, *St. Benedict and the Sixth Century* (London, 1929), contains a great mass of material, but the theses are debatable; U. BERLIERE, *L'Ordre monastique des origines au XII siècle* (Maredsous, 1919, 4th ed.); P. LUGANO, *L'Italia benedettina* (Rome, 1929).

## CHAPTER IV

### BYZANTINE AND LOMBARD ITALY

§ 22.—G. POCHETTINO. *I Longobardi nell'Italia Meridionale* (570–1080). (Caserta, 1930); L. DUCHESNE, *Les évêchés d'Italie et l'invasion lombarde* (in "Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire," 23, 1903; 25, 1905), and debating his views, A. CRIVELLUCCI, in "Studi storici," 13, 1904, p. 317; 15, 1906, p. 225; R. CESSI, *Bizantini e Longobardi in Italia nel sec. VI* (in "Atti dell'Istituto Veneto," 95, 1935–1936), which shows the Byzantine attempts at recovery, and the Frankish intervention. For St. Gregory the Great, V. see following par.

§ 23.—N. TAMASSIA, *Longobardi, Franchi e Chiesa romana fino di tempi di re Liutprando* (Bologna, 1888); C. CIPOLLA, *Della supposta fusione degli italiani coi germani nei primi secoli del Medio Evo* (in "Rendiconti dell'Accademia dei Lincei," 9, 1900); L. M. HARTMANN, *Zur Wirtschaftsgesch. Italiens im frühen Mittelalter* (Gotha, 1904); V. MONNERET DE VILLARD, *L'organizzazione industriale nell'Italia longobarda* (in "Archivio storico lombardo," 46, 1919); A. SOLMI, *L'amministrazione finanziaria del regno italico nell'alto Medio Evo* (Pavia, 1932). For Venice, besides the full and always useful collection of facts and documents, S. ROMANIN, *Storia documentata di V.* (Venice, 1853–1861), 10 vols.: H. KRETSCHMAYER, *Geschichte von Venedig*, 3 vols. (Gotha-Stuttgart, 1905–1934); R. CESSI, *Venezia ducale*, I. *Le origini*, II. *L'età eroica* (Padua, 1928–1929); and the compendious histories of A. BATTISTELLA, *La repubblica di Venezia ne' suoi undici secoli di storia* (Venice, 1921), and of E. MUSATTI, *Storia di Venezia*, 2 vols. (Milan, 1936, 3rd ed.).

For Gregory the Great see H. GRISAR, *San Gregorio Magno* (Rome, 1904, Germ. tr.); H. DUDDEN, *Gregory the Great*, 2 vols. (London, 1905); P. BATIFFOL, *Saint Gregoire le Grand* (Paris, 1928), a compendious work; SPEARING, *The Patrimony of the Roman Church in the time of Gregory the Great* (Cambridge, 1918). For the prestige of the Papacy: TH. ZWOLFER, *S. Peter Apostelfürst und Himmelspförtner. Seine Verehrung bei den Angelsachsen und Franken* (Stuttgart, 1929). For the relations between the Papacy and the Church of Ravenna: K. BRANDI, *Ravenna und Rom* (in "Archiv für Urkundenforschung," 9, 1924).

§ 24.—L. DUCHESNE. *Les premiers temps de l'état pontifical* (3rd ed., Paris 1911); A. CRIVELLUCCI, *Le origini dello stato della chiesa* (Pisa, 1909), in opposition to the last work; E. CASPAR, *Das Papsttum unter fränkischer Herrschaft* (in "Zeitz-

chrift für Kirchengeschichte," 54, 1935); L. HALPHEN, *Etudes sur l'administration de Rome au Moyen-Age* 751-1252 (Paris, 1901); L. M. HARTMANN, *Grundherrschaft und Bürokratie im Kirchenstaat vom VIII bis zum X Jahrh.* (in "Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial und Wirtschaftsgesch." 7, 1909); G. FALCO, *L'amministrazione papale nella Campagna e nella Marittima dalla caduta del dominio bizantino al sorgere dei Comuni* (in "Archivio della Società romana di storia patria," 38, 1915). For the Donation of Constantine see the new edition of R. CESSI, in the "Atti dell'Istituto Veneto," 88, 2 1928-1929. A. GAUDENZI, *Il costituito di Costantino* (in "Bullettino dell'Istituto storico italiano," 39, 1919). Recently E. BUCHNER (*Rom oder Rheims die Heimat des C.C.?*, in "Historisches Jahrbuch," 53, 1933) argues unsuccessfully that the forgery was produced at Rheims in 816, at the coronation of Louis the Pious by Stephen IV.

# CHAPTER V

## FRANKISH ITALY, THE FEUDAL ANARCHY, AND THE ROMANO-GERMANIC EMPIRE

§ 25.—K. HAMPE, *Carlo Magno* (tr. from the German, Venice, 1928); H. KLEINCLAUTZ, *Charlemagne* (Paris, 1934), out of date in respect of several questions of critical importance. A. HOFMEISTER, *Markgrafen u. Markgrafschaften im ital. Königreich* (in "Mitteil. d. österr. Instituts für Geschichtsforschung," suppl. 7, 1906); F. LANDOGNA, *L'unità del regno italico nell'alto Medio Evo* (in "Nuova rivista storica," 10, 1926); G. POCHETTINO, *I Pipinidi in Italia* (in "Archivio storico lombardo," 53, 1927); A. FALCE, *La formazione della marca di Tuscia* (Florence, 1930). Also SOLMI, *Amministrazione* (§ 23); R. POUPARDIN, *Etudes sur l'histoire des principautés lombardes de l'Italie meridionale et de leurs rapports avec l'empire franc* (in "Le Moyen Age," 19-20, 1907).

For the coronation of Charlemagne, the new Empire of the West, and the imperial ideology: A. BRACKMANN, *Die Erneuerung der Kaiserwürde im J. 800* (in the *Festgabe Hauck*, 1916); G. BRYCE, *The Holy Roman Empire*; F. KAMPERS, *Vom Werdegang der abendländischen Kaisermystik* (Leipzig, 1924); F. SCHNEIDER, *Rom und Romgedanke im Mittelalter* (Munich, 1926); A. DEMPF, *Sacrum Imperium* (trans. from the German, Messina, 1933). For Venice, see § 23.

§ 26.—See the works cited in § 25, first paragraph. For feudalism: H. MITTEIS, *Lehnrecht und Staatsgewalt. Untersuchungen zur mittelalterlichen Verfassungsgesch.* (Weimar, 1933).

§ 27.—A. DOPPSCH, *Wirtschaftsentwicklung der Karolingerzeit*, 2 vols. (Weimar, 1921-1922, 2nd ed.); E. PATZELT, *Die karolingische Renaissance* (Wien, 1924), which repudiates the notion of a Carolingian renaissance; F. NOVATI, *L'influsso del pensiero latino sopra la civiltà italiana del Medio Evo*, (Milan, 1899); G. SALVIOLI, *L'istruzione pubblica in Italia prima del Mille* (Florence, 1908, 2nd ed.); GIUS. MANACORDA, *Storia della scuola italiana*, I (Palermo, 1913); A. SOLMI,

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

*Sulla persistenza della scuola di Pavia nel Medio Evo* (in "Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo," s. 2, 58, 1925).

§ 28.—See § 25, and also: A. HENGELER, *Die Salbungen und Krönungen des Königs und Kaisers Ludwigs II*; G. POCHETTINO, *L'imperatrice Angelberga* (in "Archivio storico lombardo," 27, 1921); P. FOURNIER, *Etudes sur les fausses Décrétales* (in "Revue d'Hist. eccles.," 7-8, 1906-1907); I. HALLER, *Nikolaus I und Pseudoisidor* (Stuttgart, 1936). For the Mezzogiorno: M. AMARI, *Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1854-1872). A new annotated edition is being published by I. Nallino (Catania, 1933 ff); J. GAY, *L'Italie méridionale et l'empire byzantin 867-1071* (Paris, 1904; Ital., tr., Florence, 1917), a fundamental work for the whole period treated; M. SCHIPA, *Il Mezzogiorno d'Italia anteriormente alla monarchia: ducato di Napoli e principato di Salerno* (Bari, 1923).

§ 29.—A. LAPÔTRE, *L'Europe et le Saint-Siège à l'époque carolingienne, I: Le pape Jean VIII* (Paris, 1895). The work has not been continued; J. W. THOMPSON, *The dissolution of the Carolingian Fisc in the ninth Century* (California, 1935); HALLER (§ 28).

§ 30.—M. A. LEVI, *Contributi alla storia dei re d'Italia nel sec. X* (in "Atti dell' Acc. delle Scienze di Torino," 63, 1927-1928); C. PATRUCCO, *I Saraceni nelle Alpi Occidentali e specialmente in Piemonte* (in "Biblioteca storica subalpina," 32, 1908); C. W. PREVITE-ORTON, *Italy and Provence, 900-950* (in "English Historical Review," 32, 1917); P. FEDELE, *Ricerche per la storia di Rome e del papato nel secolo X* (in "Archivio della Società romana di storia patria," 33-34, 1910-1911); G. BUZZI, *Ricerche per la storia di Ravenna e di Rome dall'850 al 1118* (ibid., 36, 1915); W. KOELMEL, *Rom und der Kirchenstaat im 10 und 11. Jahr.* (Berlin, 1935); W. SICKEL, *Alberich II und der Kirchenstaat* (in "Mitt. des Inst. für österr. Geschichtsforschung," 23, 1922).

§ 31.—J. FICKER, *Forschungen zur Reichs- und Rechtsgeschichte Italiens*, 4 vols. (Innsbruck, 1868-1874), a fundamental work for the organization of imperial Italy; K. HAMPE, *Otto der Grosse in the Meister der Politik*, I, 1, 1922; A. VISCONTI, *La legislazione di Ottone I come conseguenza della restaurazione politica dell'impero* (in "Archivio storico lombardo," 52, 1925); M. UHLIRZ, *Die Restitution des Exarchates Ravenna durch die Ottonen* (in "Mitt. des Inst. für österr. Geschichtsforsch.," 50, 1936), which deals in a general fashion with the patrimony of St. Peter under the Ottos; R. FALK, *Italienisch-deutsche Kulturbeziehungen in der Zeit von 900 bis 1056* (in "Archiv. für Kulturgesch.," 15, 1923); G. BOSSI, *I Crescenzi* (Rome, 1915); O. GEYSTENBERG, *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Adels im Ausgange des 10. Jahr.* (in "Hist. Vierteljahrschr.," 31, 1937, which deals with the end of Giovanni Crescenzo); K. HAMPE, *K. Otto III und Rom* (in "Hist. Zeitschr.," 140, 1929); P. E. SCHRAMM, *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio . . . vom Ende d. karol. Reiches bis zum Investiturstreit* (Leipzig, 1929); A. BRACKMANN, *Der "röm. Erneuerungsgedanke" u. seine Bedeutung für die Reichspolitik der deutschen Kaiserzeit* (Berlin, 1932).



**THE FIRST CONFLICT BETWEEN PAPACY  
AND EMPIRE AND THE NORMANS IN  
THE SOUTH**

§ 32.—For the German Empire in the 11th–13th centuries see K. HAMPE, *Deutsche Kaisergesch. in der Zeit d. Salier u. Staufer* (1923, 5th ed.).—We have no comprehensive account of the *secundi milites*. For Hardouin, the old work by L. G. PROVANA, *Studi critici sovra la storia d'Italia a' tempi del re Ardoino* (Turin, 1844) still has its value; but later German historians have made essential additions and corrections. The results will be found in HARTMANN, IV, 1, last chapter. On the feudal formation of the kingdom of Italy in the 11th century see H. BRESLAU, "excursus" IV in the *Jahrb. d. deutsch. Reiches unter Conrad II* (1884). For the formation of the signoria of Canossa see U. FORMENTINI, *Sulla origine e la costituzione di un grande gentilizio feudale* (in "Atti della Società ligure di storia patria," 53, 1926).

For the period of Conrad and Henry III: P. ROTONDI, *Ariberto d'Intimiano* (in "Archivio storico italiano," 30, 1863); F. SCHUPFER, *La società milanese all'epoca del Risorgimento del Comune* (in "Archivio giuridico" (1869–1870); A. BOSISIO, *Prospettive storiche sull'età precomunale e comunale in Milano negli studi più recenti* (in "Archivio storico italiano," 94, 1936).

§ 33.—Fundamental for Italy also is the treatise of A. HAUCK, *Kirchengesch. Deutschlands*, III (Leipzig, 1906, 3rd and 4th ed.). Other works of a general character: A. DRESNER, *Kultur und Sittengesch. der ital. Geistlichkeit im X u. XI Jahr.* (Breslau, 1890); A. FLICHE, *Les Prégrégoriens* (Paris, 1916); *ibid.*, *La réforme grégorienne*, 2 vols. (Louvain, 1924–1925); J. GAY, *Les papes du XI siècle et la chrétienté* (Paris, 1926; Ital. tr., Florence, 1929); E. VOOSSEN, *Papauté et pouvoir civil à l'époque de Grégoire VII* (Gembloux, 1927); G. FALCO, *La riforma gregoriana* (in "Annali dell'istruzione media," 1930); P. SCHMID, *Begriff der kanonischen Wahl in den Anfängen der Investiturstreites* (Stuttgart, 1926), which shows the transformation of the concept in a direction ever more contrary to the royal power.

Monographs and individual treatments: BERLIERE (§ 21), chaps. IV and V, on Cluny; W. FRANKE, *Romuald von Camaldoli* (Berlin, 1913); G. B. BORINO, *L'elezione e la deposizione di Gregorio VI* (in "Archivio Soc. Rom. di storia patria," 39, 1916); D. FEYTIMANS, *Grégoire VI était-il simoniaque?* (in "Revue belge de philologie et d'hist.," 1932), which gives an affirmative reply; A. FALCE, *Bonifacio di Canossa*, 2 vols. (Reggio Emilia, 1926); N. GRIMALDI, *La contessa Matilde e la sua stirpe feudale* (Florence, 1927); P. M. BROWN, *Movimenti politico-religiosi in Milano ai tempi della Pataria* (in "Archivio storico lombardo," 57, 1932); G. B. BORINO, *Per la storia della chiesa nel sec. XI* (in "Archivio Soc. rom. di storia patria," 58, 1915), which deals with the relations between the Papacy, Montecassino, and the Normans, and the conclusion of the Papal-Norman

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

alliance; A. FLICHE, *Saint Grégoire VII* (Paris, 1920); F. KEHR, *Zur Gesch. Wiboris v. Ravenna* (in "Sitz.-Ber." of the Berlin Academy, 1921).

§ 34.—For the evolution of canon law see the histories of ecclesiastical law, in particular those of FRIEDBERG (Ital. tr. by Ruffini) and SÄGMÜLLER.

For the Cistercians and St. Bernard: BERLIÈRE (§ 21), chap. VI; E. VACANDARD, *Vie de saint Bernard*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1920, 4th ed.); G. GOYAU, *S.B.* (Paris, 1927); H. FECHNER, *Die Politischen Theorien des Abtes Bernhard v. Cl. in seinen Briefen* (Bonn, 1933). For the Crusades in general we will cite only the quite recent work of R. GROSSET, *Histoire des Croisades*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1934).

## CHAPTER VII

### THE COMMUNES AND THE KINGDOM

§ 35.—A comprehensive study of the persistence and recovery of urban life (with a tendency to exaggerate the significance of the data, and the continuity between the pre-communal and the communal period) is: L. CHIAPPELLI, *La formazione storica del comune cittadino in Italia* (in "Archivio storico italiano," 84-88, 1926-1930). The literature treating of the communes in general (§ 36) naturally develops the arguments of this section. For the evolution and expansion of economic life a fundamental work is: A. DOREN, *Storia economica dell'Italia nel Medio Evo*, trans. from the German (Padua, 1937), whose ample bibliography is useful.—For the corporations see the same work, Chap. II, 3, and F. VALSECCHI, *Le corporazioni nell'organismo politico del Medio Evo* (Milan, 1921). On the problem of their connection with those of Byzantine Italy and the Late Empire see P. S. LEICHT, *Corporazioni romane e arti medievali* (Turin, 1937), who, though inclined to answer the question in the affirmative, gives the various opinions, and a bibliography.

§ 36.—A sketch of the problems relating to the origins of the communes will be found in G. VOLPE, *Medio Evo italiano* (Florence, 1923), Chap. I. A compendious general treatment is: N. OTTOKAR, *I Comuni*, art. in *Enc. italiana*, XI (and in "Civiltà moderna," I, 1930). See also L. V. HEINEMANN, *Zur Entstehung d. Stadtverfassung in Italien* (Leipzig, 1896). For the origins of certain of the larger communes: Milan, §32; R. DRAGONI, *Il comune di Pavia fra il 1000 e il 1200* (in "Bollettino d. Soc. Pavese di St. Patria," 29, 1930); L. SIMEONI, *Le origine del comune di Verona* (in "Nuovo Archivio veneto," 21, 1913); M. ROBERTI, *Nuove ricerche sopra l'antica costituzione di Padova* (ibid., n. s., III, 1902); R. DAVIDSON, *Ueber die Entstehung d. Konsulats in Toskana* (in "Hist. Vierteljahrschr.," 1900).

On the foreign elements in Italy: G. VOLPE, *Lombardi e Romani nelle campagne e nelle città* (in "Studi Storici," 13-14, 1904-1905); G. SCHWARTZ, *Die Besetzung d. Bistümer Reichsitalien unter d. sächs. u. salisch. Kaisern* (Leipzig, 1913).

On the conflicts between communes and bishops: G. VOLPE, *Medio Evo italiano*, Chap. VII.

On the relations between town and country: G. DE VERGOTTINI, *Origine e sviluppo della comitatina* (in "Studi senesi," I, 1929). For the rural communes the most comprehensive work is R. CAGGESE, *Classi e comuni rurali nel M. E. italiano*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1907-1909); the most recent, G. P. BOGNETTI, *Sulle origini dei comuni rurali nel M.E.* (in "Studi giuridici e sociologici dell'Università di Pavia," XXX, 1927). An individual and indefensible opinion (the theory that the rural communes derive mainly from the Lombard *arimannie*) is that of FEODOR SCHNEIDER, *Die Entstehung v. Burg-u. Landgemeinde in Italien* (Berlin, 1924). On the markets see the very full work of F. CARLI, *Il mercato nell'età del comune* (Padua, 1936), which follows the *Mercato nell'alto Medio Evo*. On the enfranchisement of the serfs see DOREN, p. 187 ff., and P. VACCARI, *L'affrancazione dei servi della gleba nell'Emilia e nella Toscana* (Bologna, 1926).

§ 37.—On Florence see the classic *Geschichte v. F.* of R. DAVIDSOHN, vol. 4 (Berlin 1896-1927), which comes down to the 15th century, and the *Forschungen zur Gesch. v. F.*, vol. 4 (Berlin, 1876-1908). One may add to this R. CAGGESE, *Firenze dalla decadenza di Roma al Risorgimento d'Italia*, 3 vols. (Florence, 1912-1921). A modest compendium: A. PANELLA, *Firenze* (Rome, 1930). For the relations between the city and the countryside see J. PLESNER, *L'émigration de la campagne à la ville de Florence au XIII siècle* (Copenhagen, 1934).

On Pisa: G. VOLPE, *Studi sulle istituzioni comunali a P. nei sec. XII-XIII* (Pisa, 1902). On Sardinia see the old work by G. MANNO, *Storia della Sardegna*, vol. 4 (Turin, 1825-1827); E. BESTA, *La S. Medievale*, 2 vols. (Palermo, 1908-1909). Corsica: U. FORMENTINI, *La conquista d.C.* (in "Giorn. stor. e lett. d. Liguria," I, 1925).

For Venice see § 23.

Southern cities: GAY, § 28. Communes of Apulia: F. CARABELLESE, *L'Apulia e il suo C. nell'alto M. E.* (Bari, 1925).

§ 38.—See the histories of Italian art in VENTURI and (down to the 13th century) in TOESCA. For literature: NOVATI and MONTEVERDI, *Le origini* (Milan, 1926), which forms part of the "Storia letteraria Vallardi." For philosophy and science a detailed treatment with very full bibliography will be found in Ueberweg's manual, 11, 11th ed. Berlin, 1928, contributed by B. GEYER. Also G. DE RUGGIERO, *Storia della filosofia*, p. II, 3 vols. (Bari, 1920), and a brief exposition by E. GILSON, *La phil. au m. -d.* (Paris, 1922, in the Payot collection).

§ 39.—For the period in general see GAMPE, 32. For the Norman kingdom: CH. LANDON, §32, and the collective work, *Il regno Normanno* (Messina, 1932). On Roger II; R. II und die Grundung d. norm.-sicilischen Monarchie (Innsbruck, 1905).

§ 40.—No subject has been more neglected by contemporary Italian scholars than the history of the commune of Rome. We have always to refer to GRE-

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

GOROVIVS, (§ 15), and we may also usefully consult F. PAPENCORDT, *Gesch. d. Stadt R. im Mittel.* (1857). L'HALPHEN, § 24, is almost entirely institutional and very exiguous: half the volume consists of lists.—Arnaldo of Brescia: A. DE STEFANO, *A. da B. e i suoi tempi* (Rome, 1921); C. W. GREENAWAY, *A. of B.* (London, 1931).

§ 41.—On the period of the Hohenstaufen in I. JASTROW and C. WINTER, *Deutsche Gesch. im Zeitalter d. H.*, 2 vols. (1897–1901). Individual studies: A. FUMAGALLI, *Le vicende di Milano durante la guerra con Federico I* (Milan, 1885); G. BE. SIRACUSA, *Il regno di Guglielmo I* (Palermo, 1929, 2nd ed.).

§ 42.—A. VIGNATI, *Storia diplomatica della lega lombarda* (Milan, 1867); P. KEHR, *Friedrich I u. Venedig während d. Schismas* (in "Quellen und Forsch. aus d. ital. Archiven," 17, Rome, 1924).

§ 43.—W. LENEL, *Der Konstanzer Frieden v. 1183 u. die ital. Politik Fr. I* (in "Hist. Zeitschr.," 128, 1923); M. KAUFMANN, *Die ital. Pol. Fr. I nach den Friede v. Constanç* (Greifswald, 1933); G. TOMASSETTI, *La pace di Roma* (1188) in "Rivista internazionale di scienze sociali," 4, 1896; J. HALLER, *Heinrich VI u. die röm. Kirche* (in "Mitt. Inst. österr. Gesch.-Forsch.," 35, 1914); V. PRAFF, *K. Heinrichs VI höchstes Angebot an die röm. Kurie* (in "Heidelberger Abhandl.," 55, 1927).

## CHAPTER VIII

### GUELFs AND Ghibellines, Nobles AND PEOPLE

§ 44.—The fundamental work on Innocent III is still A. LUCHAIRE, I, III, 6 vols. (Paris, 1907–1911). W. COHN, *L'età degli Hohenst. in Sicilia* (tr. from the German, Catania, 1932); F. BAETHGEN, *Die Regentschaft Inn. III in Sizilien* (Heidelberg, 1914).

§ 45.—F. COGNASSO, *Umberto Biancamano* (Turin, 1930); L. SIMEONI, *Il comune veronese sino a Ezzelino* (in "Misc. St. Ven.," s. 3, 15, 1920); P. ERMINI, *Le libertà comunali nello stato della chiesa 1198–1367* (in "Arch. Soc. rom. st. patria," 49, 1926); C. FINZI, *Storia della città di Viterbo*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1887–1889); G. FALCO, *I comuni della Campagna e della Marittima nel Medio Evo* (in "Arch. Soc. rom. st. patria," 42–49, 1919–1926); F. CARABELLESE, *Il comune pugliese durante la monarchia normanno-sveva* (Bari, 1924); G. GENUARDI, *Il commune nel Medio Evo in Sicilia* (Palermo, 1921); R. DAVIDSOHN, *Die Popularbewegung in ital. Städte bis zur Mitte d. XIII Jahr.* (in *Forsch. zur Gesch. v. Florenz*, IV, 1908); I. GHIRON, *La credenza di Santi Ambrogio* (Milan, 1878); G. FASOLI, *La Compagnia delle armi a Bologna* (in "Archiginnasio," 28, 1933); U. G. MONDOLFO, *Il popolo di Siena. . . fino alla riforma antimagnatizia del 1277* (Genoa, 1911); U. FRANCHINE, *Saggio de ricerche sull'istituto del Podestà* (Bologna, 1912);

E. SESTAN, *Ricerche intorno ai primi podestà toscani* (in "Arch. stor. it," 82, 1924).

For the conflicts with the clergy see § 36. For the communal statutes and Roman law see the histories of Italian law (PERTILE, SALVIOLI, SOLMI, etc.).

For the characteristics of the moral and social life of Italy in this period see L. SALVATORELLI, *Vita di San Francesco d'Assisi* (Bari, 1928, 2nd ed.), Chap. II. On the problem of the unity of Italian history, Id., *L'unità d. st. it.* (in "Pan," Feb. 1934), with the references there contained (on p. 360 to previous writers on the subject). Recently, a very brief note by CROCE in "Critica," 1934, p. 138, with a new statement of the problem, denying in general the possibility of national histories; and the same, at greater length, in *Recenti controversie intorno all'unità della storia d'Italia* (in "Proceedings of the British Academy," XXII, 1936). The unity of the historical fabric is, of course, beyond dispute; but the existence and development of the nations is *one* of the standpoints from which one may consider it. In our case the question is to decide if and when, before the period of the Risorgimento, we can speak of a national Italian consciousness, and therefore of an Italian people. Let us remember that we cannot in any case go beyond the 12th century, and that we can speak of an embryonic national consciousness even in the Roman period.

For the influence of ancient Rome on the Italian Middle Ages see G. GRAF, *Roma nella memoria e nelle immaginazioni del Medio Evo*, 2 vols. (Turin, 1882-1883); F. NOVATI, *L'influsso del pensiero latino sopra la civiltà italiana del Medio Evo* (Milan, 1899, 2nd ed.).

§ 47.—V. The histories of art cited in §§ 38. For literary history, the same section, and G. BERTONI, *Il Duecento* (Milan), whose volumes should be consulted even for the following period. There is also the fine compendium of V. ROSSI, *Storia della letteratura italiana*, 3 vols. (Milan, Vallardi, in many successive editions), and the very useful manual by BACCI and D'ANCONA, 6 vols. (Florence, Barbera). A book to read and ponder is *Storia della letteratura italiana* of FRANCESCO DE SANCTIS (recent ed., Bari, 1912).

For the Latin historical writers see U. BALZANI, *Le cronache italiane nel Medio Evo* (Milan, 1909, 3rd ed.), and G. LISIO, *La storiografia* (Milan, 1905); DAHLMANN-WAITZ, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte* (1931, 9th ed.). For the history of philosophy and science, § 38. On Gioacchino da Fiore E. BUONAIUTI, *G. da F.* (Rome, 1931); G. GRUNDMANN, *Studien über J. v. Fl.* (Leipzig, 1927).

§ 48.—For the Italian universities, see MANACORDA (§ 27); E. COPPI, *Le università ital. nel Medio Evo* (Florence, 1886, 3rd ed.); P. VACCARI, *L'università italiana nella storia* (Modena, 1926); C. ZACCAGNINI, *Storia dello studio di Bologna durante il Rinascimento* (Geneva, 1930); the collective work (TORRACA, etc.), *Storia dell'università di Napoli* (Naples, 1924). For Aristotelism see § 38.

§ 49.—F. TOCCO, *L'eresia nel Medio Evo* (Florence, 1884); J. V. DOLLINGER, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalt.* (Munich, 1890); A. DE STEFANO, *Saggio sui moti ereticali dei secoli XII e XIII* (Rome, 1915); G. VOLPE, *Movimenti religiosi e sette ereticali nella società medievale italiana* (Florence, 1922);

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

SALVATORELLI, § 39; H. GRUNDMANN, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter* (Berlin, 1935); CH. MOLINIER, *L'église et la société cathares* (in "Revue histor.," 94-95, 1907); H. G. WARNER, *The Albigensian Heresy* (2 vols. London, 1922-1928); E. COMBA, *Storia dei Valdesi*, new ed. (Torre Pellice, 1930).

H. CH. LEA, *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, 3 vols. (New York, 1888); C. DOUAIS, *The Inq. from its establishment to the Great Schism* (London, 1927).

A. G. LITTLE, *A guide to Franciscan studies* (London, 1920); V. FACHINETTI, *San Francesco d'Assisi* (Rome, 1928), Guida bibliografica; P. SABATIER, *Vie de S. François d'Assise* (Paris, 1931); SALVATORELLI (see above); H. TILEMANN, *Studien zur Individualität des Fr. v. A.* (1914); H. HOLZAPFEL, *Handbuch der Gesch. des Fr. Ordens* (Freiburg im Br., 1909); P. GRATIEN, O. M. Cap., *Histoire de la fondation et de l'évolution de L'O. des Frères Mineurs au XIII siècle* (Paris, 1928); G. BONDATTI, *Gioachinismo e francescanesimo nel dugento* (Santa Maria degli Angeli, 1924); H. C. SCHEEBEN, *Der bl. Dominikus* (Freiburg im Br., 1927), and taking the opposite view B. ALTANER, *Zur Beurteilung d. Persönlichkeit u. d. Entwicklung d. Ordensidee d. bl. Dom.* (in "Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.," 46, 1927); A. M. WALZ, *Compendium historiae Ordinis Praedicatorum* (Rome, 1930).

§ 50.—For the agricultural and commercial development of Italy in this era see DOREN (§ 35).

The Fourth Crusade: W. NORDEN, *Der vierte Kreuzzug* (Berlin, 1898); E. GERLAND, *D. v. Kr. und seine Probleme* (in "Neue Jahrbücher für d. klass. Altertum," 13, 1904).

§ 51.—E. KANTOROWICZ, *Friedrich II*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1898); H. J. PYBUS, *Frederick II and the Sicilian Church* (in "Cambridge Hist. Journal," III, 1929-1931); A. DE STEFANO, *Federico I e le correnti spirituali del suo tempo* (Rome, 1922); ID., *L'idea imperiale di F. II* (Florence, 1927); C. H. HASKINS, *Science at the court of the emp. F. II* (in "The Amer. Hist. Revue," 27, 1922); ID., *Latin Literature under F. II* (in "Speculum," 3, 1928); W. GROSS, *Die Revolutionen in der Stadt Rom 1219-1254* (Berlin, 1934).

§ 52.—A. BERGMANN, *König Manfred* (Heidelberg, 1909); H. ARNDT, *Studien zur inneren Regierungsgesch. M.* (ibid., 1911); E. JORDAN, *Les origines de la domination angevine en Italie* (Paris, 1909); G. M. MONTI, *La dominazione angioina in Piemonte* (Turin, 1930); C. MANFRONI, *Le relazioni tra Genova, l'impero bizantino e i Turchi* (in "Atti Società Ligure st. patria," 28, 1898).

## CHAPTER IX

### THE PAPACY, THE ANGEVINS, AND THE SIGNORIE

§ 53.—E. SALZER, *Ueber die Anfänge der Signorie in Oberitalien* (Berlin, 1900), who deals mainly with the period of the Captains of the People; F. ERCOLE,

*Dal comune alla signoria* (Florence, 1929); L. SIMBONI, *La formazione della signoria scaligera* (in "Atti dell'accademia di Verona," 3, 5, 3, 1926); F. POGGI, *Le guerre civili di Genova dalle origini del comune fino al 1528* (in "Atti Soc. Ligure St. Patria," 54, 1930); U. G. MONDOLFO, *Le cause e le vicende della politica del comune di Siena nel sec. XIII* (Siena, 1904). For the Credenza di Sant'Ambrogio v. § 45.

§ 54.—C. MINIERI-RICCIO, *Il regno di Carlo I dal 1273 al 1283* (in "Archivio storico italiano," Florence, 1875–1881); A. BOZZOLA, *Guglielmo VII di Monferrato* (in "Miscellanea di storia italiana," 50, Turin, 1922).

§ 55.—E. STHAMER, *Aus der Vorgeschichte der sizilischen Vesper* (in "Quellen und Forsch. aus den ital. Archiven," Rome, 1927); M. AMARI, *Storia della guerra del vespro siciliano*, 3 vols. (Milan, 1886, 9th ed.); O. CARTELLIERI, *Peter von Aragon und die sizil. Vesper* (Heidelberg, 1904); G. LA MANTIA, *Codice diplomatico dei re aragonesi di Sicilia*, I (Palermo, 1918), introduction; R. TRIFONE, *La legislazione angioina* (Naples 1921); R. MOSCATI, *Ricerche e docum. sulla feudal. napol. nel periodo angioino* (in "Arch. stor. per le provincie napol.," 59, 1934). For the Kingdom of Naples after its separation from Sicily: B. CROCE, *Storia del regno di Napoli* (Bari, 1931, 2nd ed.).

§ 56.—For Upper Italy see §§ 53 and 54; and for Piedmont in the second half of the 13th century: A. TALLONE, *Tommaso I marchese di Saluzzo 1294–1296* (Pinerolo, 1916).

For Florence: G. SALVEMINI, *Magnati e popolani in Firenze dal 1280 al 1285* (Florence, 1899); for the other side of the question N. OTTOKAR, *Il comune di Firenze alla fine del Duecento* (Florence, 1927); G. MASI, *Il popolo di Firenze alla fine del Duecento* (Modena, 1928); ID., *La struttura sociale delle fazioni politiche fiorentine ai tempi di Dante* (in "Giornale dantesco," 1930); ID., *Sull'origine dei Bianchi e dei Neri* (ibid., 1927).

§ 57.—MANFRONI, 52; G. I. BRATIANU, *Recherches sur le commerce génois dans la Mer Noire au XIII siècle* (Paris, 1929); M. MERORES, *Der Venet. Adel, der Grosse Rat von Venedig u. die sogenn. "Serrata" v. 1337* (in "Vierteljahrschrift für Wirtschaftsgech.," 19–21, 1926–1928).

§ 58.—T. S. BOASE, *Boniface VIII* (London, 1933); E. BENZ, *Ecclesia spiritualis, Kirchenidee u. Geschichtstheologie der franzisk. Reformation* (Stuttgart, 1934); P. FEDELE, *Per la storia dell'attentato de Anagni* (in "Bullettino dell'ist. st. it.," 41, 1921); G. MOTTAT, *Les papes d'Avignon* (Paris, 1912); W. E. LUNT, *Papal revenues in the Middle Ages*, 2 vols. (New York, 1934).—For Jacopone da Todi see the literary histories.

§ 59.—FCH. SCHNEIDER, *K. Heinrich VII*, 3 vols. (1924–1928); U. COSMO, *Vita de Dante* (Bari, 1930), with the selected bibliography here indicated; R. CAGGESE, *Roberto d'Angiò*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1922–1931); H. OTTO, *Zur ital. Politik Joh. XXII* (in "Quellen u. Forsch. aus ital. Arch.," 14, Rome, 1911);

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

H. SPANGENBERG, *Cangrande I v. Scala* (Berlin, 1892); L. CIACCIO, *Bertrando del Poggetto in Bologna* (Bologna, 1906, 2nd ed.); C. CAPASSO, *La signoria viscontea e le lotte politico-religiose con il papato nella prima metà del sec. XIV* (in "Bollettino Soc. Pavese di st. patria," 1908); *Miscellanea Castruccio Castracani* (Florence, 1934), by the Royal Lucchese Academy: F. TOCCO, *La questione della povertà nel sec. XIV* (Naples, 1910); D. L. DOVIE, *The Nature and the Effect of the Heresy of the Fraticelli* (London, 1932); F. BATTAGLIA, *Marsilio di Padova e la filosofia politica del M. Evo* (Florence, 1928); A. PASSERIN D'ENTRÈVES, *Rileggendo il "Defensor Pacis"* (in "Rivista stor. it.," 51, 1934), against the "modernistic" interpretation of Marsilius; C. W. PREVITE-ORTON, *Mars. of P.* (in "Proceedings of the British Academy," 21, 1935).

§ 60.—F. COGNASSO, *Note e documenti sulla formazione dello stato visconteo* (in "Boll. Soc. Pavese st. patria," 23, 1923); Id., *Ricerche per la storia dello stato visconteo* (ibid. 26, 1926); N. RODOLICO, *Il popolo minuto, note di storia fiorentina 1343-1378* (Bologna, 1899); E. HABERKERN, *Der Kampf um Sizilien 1302-1337* (Diss., Freiburg, 1921); G. LA MANTIA, *L'ordinamento interno del regno di Sicilia sotto gli Aragonesi 1282-1409* (Palermo, 1934). For Robert of Anjou see § 59.

## CHAPTER X

### THE VISCONTI, FLORENCE, AND THE PAPACY

§ 61.—A work of great utility, by reason of its masses of data, in C. CIPOLIA's *Storia delle Signorie italiane dal 1313 al 1530* (Milan, 1881, in the first Collezione Vallardi); SALZER, ERCOLE, § 53; A. ANZILOTTI, *Per la storia delle signorie e del diritto pubblico italiano nel Rinascimento* (in "Studi Storici," 22, 1914); F. ERCOLE, *Da Bartolo all'Althusio* (Florence, 1932); L. SIMEONI, *Ricerche sulle origini della signoria estense a Modena* (Modena, 1919); G. CITTADELLA, *Storia della dominazione carrarese in Padova* (Padua, 1842); N. RODOLICO, *Dal comune alla signoria. Saggio sul governo di Taddeo Pepoli in Bologna* (Bologna, 1898).

§ 62.—The most comprehensive work on the subject is still E. RICOTTI's *Storia delle compagnie di ventura in Italia* (Turin, 1893, 2nd ed.). Cf. PIERI, 81.

§ 63.—The works indicated in §§ 38, 47. Also for Dante see U. COSMO (§ 59), with the biography. For Italian painting see R. VAN MARLE, *The development of the Italian schools of painting* (L'Asia, 1922, ff.).

§ 64.—See in general, G. PIRCHAN, *Italien u. K. Karl IV in der Zeit seiner zweiten Romfahrt* (Prague, 1930); and the bibliography of 61. Also: P. SILVA, *Il governo di Pietro Gambacorta in Pisa e le sue relazioni col resto della Toscana e coi Visconti* (in "Annali d. R. Sc. normale sup. di Pisa," 1911); N. CATURGLI, *Le signoria di Giovanni dell'Agnello* (Pisa, 1921).



§ 65.—A. ANZILOTTI, *La crisi costituzionale della repubblica fiorentina* (Florence, 1912); G. DEGLI AZZI-VITELLESCHI, *Le relazioni tra la repubblica di Firenze e l'Umbria nei secoli XIII-XIV* (Perugia, 1904-1909); C. CALISSE, *I prefetti di Vico* (in "Arch. Soc. rom. st. patria," 10-11, 1887-1888); A. DE BOUARD, *Le régime politique et les institutions de Rome au Moyen-Age 1252-1347* (Paris, 1920); P. PIUR, *Cola di Rienzo*, trans. from German (Milan, 1934); F. FILIPPINI, *Il card. Alborno* (Bologna, 1933); F. ERMINI, *Gli ordinamenti politici e amministrativi nelle "Constitutiones Aegidiane"* (Turin, 1894); ID. *I parlamenti provinciali dello stato ecclesiastico nel Medio Evo* (Rome, 1905).

§ 66.—G. ROMANO, *La guerra tra i Visconti e la Chiesa 1369-1376* (in "Boll. Soc. Pavese st. patria," 3, 1903); N. RODOLICO, *La democrazia fiorentina nel suo tramonto 1378-1382* (Bologna, 1904); A. GHERARDI, *La guerra degli Otto Santi* (in "Archivio storico italiano," 3 s., 5-8, 1967-1868); EMILIA DE SANCTIS ROSMINI, *Vita di Santa Caterina di Siena* (Turin, 1930); A. ALESSANDRINI, *Il ritorno d. Papi da Avignone e S. Caterina de S.* (in "Arch. Soc. rom. st. patria," 56-57, 1933-1934); N. VALOIS, *La France et le Grand Schisme de l'Occident*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1896-1902); L. SALEMBIER, *Le Gr. Schisme d'O.* (Paris, 1900). A compendious exposition of the schism and its termination will be found in PASTOR (§ 72), I.

§ 67.—G. COGNASSO, *Il Conte Verde* (Turin, 1926); ID., *Il Conte Rosso* (ibid., 1931); ID., *Amedeo VIII*, 2 vols. (ibid. 1930); P. FALLETTI, *Il tumulto dei Ciompi* (Turin, 1882); RODOLICO, § 66; A. RADO, *Maso degli Albizzi e il partito oligarchico in Firenze dal 1382 al 1393* (Florence, 1927); E. G. LEONARD, *Histoire de Jeanne I*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1932); M. SCHIPA, *Nobili e popolani in Napoli nel Medio Evo* (in "Archivio stor. it.," 83, 1929).

## CHAPTER XI

### FINAL FORMATION AND CONFLICTS OF THE ITALIAN PRINCIPALITIES

§ 68.—L. SIMEONI, *La crisi decisiva della signoria scaligera* (in "Archivio veneto-tridentino," 9, 1926); I. RAULICH, *La caduta dei Carraresi* (Padua, 1890); E. GALLI, *Facino Cane e le guerre guelfo-ghibelline nell'Italia settentrionale*, 1360-1400 (in "Archivio storico lombardo," 24, 1897). There is no monograph on Gian Galeazzo. Generally speaking, the Italian literature on this period is more fragmentary and dry-as-dust than usual.

§ 69.—SILVA, § 65.

§ 70.—A. CUTOLO, *Re Ladislao*, 2 vols. (Milan, 1936); N. VALOIS, *Le pape et le concile*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1909).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

§ 71.—A. SCHIFF, *K. Siegmunds italienische Politik* (Frankfurt, 1910); A. BATTISTELLA, *Il conte di Carmagnola* (Genoa, 1889).

§ 72.—From this point the fundamental work of reference—though it has little historical value in the higher sense of the word, and is tendentious in its "Curialism"—is the *Geschichte der Päpste* of L. VON PASTOR, in 16 vols., trans. into Italian: *Storia dei papi dalla fine del Medio Evo* (Rome, 1900–1934). For this see also VALOIS, § 70, also: N. F. FARAGLIA, *Storia della regina Giovanna II* (Lanciano, 1904); ID., *Storia della lotta tra Alfonso d'Aragona e Renato D'Angiò* (ibid. 1908).

§ 73.—A. DAINELLI, *Niccolò da Uzzano*. For the Medici: there is a great collection of miniature documented biographies in G. PIERACCINI, *La stirpe dei Medici di Cafaggiolo*, 3 vols. (Florence, 1925). Cosimo de' Medici and Francesco Sforza have not found biographers.

§ 74.—F. ANTONINI, *La pace di Lodi e i segreti maneggi che la prepararono* (in "Arch. stor. lomb.," 56, 1930); G. SORANZO, *La Lega italiana* (Milan, 1924).

## CHAPTER XII

### THE BALANCE OF POWER— THE RENAISSANCE

§ 75.—M. FORMENTINI, *Il ducato di Milano* (Milan, 1876); F. MALAGUZZI-VALERI, *La corte di Ludovico il Moro*, 4 vols. (Milan, 1913–1923).

§ 77.—E. NUNZIANTE, *I primi anni de Ferdinando d'Aragona e l'invasione di Giovanni d'Angiò* (in "Archivio storico napol.," 17–23, 1892–1898).

§ 78.—A. VON REUMONT, *Lorenzo dei Medici*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1883, 2nd ed.); R. PALMAROCCHI, *La politica italiana di Lorenzo de' Medici. Firenze nella guerra contro Innocenzo VIII* (Florence, 1933).

§ 79.—The classic work on the Renaissance is J. BURCKHARDT, *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien*, 2 vols. (1860; 1919, 12th ed.) (English translation, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, Phaidon Press, Vienna, Allen and Unwin, London; illustr.). After this, G. VOIGT, *Die Wiederbelebung des klass. Altertums*, 2 vols. (1893, 3rd ed.), which regards the Renaissance in a restricted sense. Also J. HUIZINGA, *Das Problem der Renaissance* (trans. from the Dutch, 1927); E. CASSIRER, *Individuo e cosmo nella filosofia del Rinascimento* (trans. from the German, Florence, 1935, first pub. 1927); E. WALSER, *Gesammelte Studien zur Geistesgeschichte d. Renaissance* (Basle, 1932), which repudiates the clear break between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, and the anti-religious character of the latter; K. BURDACH, *Die seelischen n. geistigen Quellen d. Renaissancebewegung*

(in "Historische Zeitschrift," 149, 1934), who defends her conception of the Renaissance as the evolution of mediaeval culture. An author who refers to recent questions concerning the Renaissance is E. ANAGNINE, *Il problema del Rinascimento* (in "Nuova rivista storica," 18, 1934). See also V. ZABUGHIN, *Storia del Rinascimento cristiano in Italia* (Milan, 1924); I. PUSINO, *Ficinos u. Picos religiös-philosophische Anschauungen* (in "Zeitschrift für Kirchengesch.," 44, 1925). For literature and art see the histories of Italian letters and art. VENTURI gives us a complete inventory of Italian painting from the Renaissance onwards. The works of B. BERENSON are also of great importance in this connection.

§ 80.—See the final section of DOREN (§35). For Columbus see art. in *Enciclopedia italiana*, X, by A. MAGNAGHI.

# CHAPTER XIII

## THE FOREIGN INVASIONS

§ 81.—For European politics in this period see E. FUETER, *Storia del sistema degli stati europei 1492–1559*, trans. from the German (Florence, 1932); H. HAUSER and A. RENAUDET, *Les débuts de l'âge moderne* (Paris, 1934), in the Collezione Alcan. For Italian conditions these are important: P. VILLARI, *Niccolò Machiavelli e i suoi tempi*, 3 vols. (Milan, 1895–1896, 2nd ed.), and O. TOMMASINI, *La vita e gli scritti di N. M. nella loro relazione col machiavellismo*, 2 vols. (Turin-Rome, 1883–1911). For military conditions: P. PIERI, *La crisi militare italiana nel Rinascimento* (Naples, 1933).

§ 82.—P. NEGRI, Milan, *Ferrara e impero durante l'impresa di Carlo VIII in Italia* (in "Arch. stor. lomb.," 43, 1917); *Id.*, *Studi sulla crisi politica italiana alla fine del sec. XV* (ibid. 50–51, 1924–1925); P. PIERI, *Intorno a. pol. estera di Venezia al principio del Cinquecento* (Naples, 1934); H. ULMANN, *Kaiser Maximilian I*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1884–1891); M. v. WOLFF, *Die Beziehungen K. M. I. zu Italien 1495–1508* (Vienna, 1909). On Savonarola: P. VILLARI, *Storia di Girolamo Savonarola e dei suoi tempi*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1929, 4th ed.); G. SCHNITZER, *Savonarola*, 2 vols. (Munich, 1924), trans. from German (Milan, 1931); R. RIDOLFI, *Studi Savonaroliani* (Florence, 1925), concerning the sermons and their content.

§ 83.—L. G. PÉLISSIER, *Louis XII et L. Sforza*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1896). For the State of the Church in general see M. BROSCHE, *Geschichte des Kirchenstaates*, 2 vols. (Hamburg, 1880), and by the same, *Julius II u. die Gründung des Kirchenst.* (Gotha, 1878).

§ 84.—See works on Maximilian, Louis XII and Julius II, §§ 82–83. For Leo X: F. NITTI, *Leone X e la sua politica* (Florence, 1892); G. B. PICOTTI, *La congiura dei cardinali contro Leone X* (in "Rivista stor. ital.," 40, 1923).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

§ 85.—G. DE LEVA, *Storia documentata di Carlo V in correlazione all'Italia* 5 vols. (Venice-Padua, 1863-1894); C. GIODA, *Girolamo Morone e i suoi tempi* (Florence, 1929); A. VALORI, *La difesa della repubblica fiorentina* (Florence, 1929).

§ 86.—See the literary and artistic histories. On Machiavelli, § 81. On Guicciardini: A. OTETEA, *François Guichardin* (Paris, 1926).

## CHAPTER XIV

### *THE REFORMATION AND COUNTER-REFORMATION. THE PAPACY AND THE EMPIRE RULE ITALY*

§ 87.—For the religious conditions of Italy see PASTOR (§ 72), Intro. to Vol. III, and P. TACCHI VENTURI, *Storia della Compagnia di Gesù in Italia*, Vol. I (Rome, 1931, 2nd ed.). On the Reformation in Italy and the Italian Reformers the most recent work is F. C. CHURCH, *The Italian Reformers*. There is also A. PASCAL, *Da Lucca a Ginevra. Studi sulla emigrazione religiosa lucchese* (in "Rivista stor. it.," 49-50, 1932-1933); B. NICOLINI, *Francesco Stancaro. Contributo alla storia della riforma in Italia* (Rome, 1936) (extracted from "Religio"); E. CLONE, *Juan de Valdés. La sua vita e il suo pensiero religioso* (Bari, 1938).

§ 88.—C. CAPASSO, *Paolo III*, 2 vols. (Messina, 1924); W. FRIEDENSBURG, *Kaiser Karl V u. Papst Paul III* (Leipzig, 1932), which maintains that religion was the prime interest of the first, politics of the second; A. SEGRE, *Carlo II di Savoia, le sue relazioni con Francia e Spagna e le guerre piemontesi dal 1536 al 1545* (in "Memorie Acc. Scienze Torino," 52, 1902); ID., *Appunti di storia sabauda dal 1546 al 1553* (in "Atti Acc. Lincei," s. 5., 12, 1903); ID., *La questione sabauda e gli avvenimenti politici e militari che prepararono la tregua di Vaucelles* (in "Memorie Acc. Torino," 55, 1905); F. CHABOD, *Lo stato di Milano dell'impero di Carlo V*, v. I (Rome, 1934); R. MASSIGNAN, *Il primo duca di Parma e Piacenza e la congiura del 1547* (Parma, 1907); E. SCAPINELLI, *Le riforme sociali del duca Pier Luigi Farnese* (in "Rassegna nazionale," 147, 1906); P. COURTEAUT, *Blaise de Montluc historien* (Paris, 1908), on the Siennese war.

§ 89.—General works: E. GÖTHEIN, *Stato e società nell'età della controriforma* trans. from the German (Venice, 1930, 2nd ed.); E. MÂLE, *L'art. religieux après le concile de Trente* (Paris, 1932). There is no critical modern history of the Council of Trent. For the Papacy in the period of the Counter-Reformation the fundamental work is RANKE, *Die Römischen in den letzten vier Jahrhunderten*. A convenient edition in one volume, but without notes, has recently been published in Vienna by the Phaidon Press.

Individual studies: M. BENDISCIOLI, *L'inizio della controversia giurisdizionale a Milano tra l'arcivesc. Carlo Borromeo e il senato milanese 1566-1568* (in "Arch. stor. lomb.," 52, 1926); F. BARBIERI, *La Controriforma nello stato di Milano da*

*Santi Antonino a San Carlo Borromeo* (in "Boll. Soc. Pavese st. patria," 13, 1913); ID., *Alcuni caratteri della controriforma in Lombardia. Il rinnovamento degli studi ecclesiastici e la riforma della letteratura profana* (in "Giornale storico della lett. ital.," 87, 1926); G. SFORZA, *Riflessi della Controriforma nella rep. di Venezia* (in "Arch. stor. it.," 93, 1935); L. PONNELLE and L. BORDET, *Saint Philippe Neri et la société romaine de son temps* (Paris, 1928); F. CUTHBERT, O. M. CAP., *The Capuchins. A contribution to the history of the counter-reformation* (London, 1928).

There is no comprehensive work on the Jesuits (and Ignatius Loyola). We may refer to the meagre outline by H. BOEHMER, to be consulted preferably in the French edition, *Les Jésuites* (Paris, 1910), with the additions of G. MONOD. The history by TACCHI VENTURI (§ 87) stops at the second volume, *Dalla nascita del fondatore alla solenne approvazione dell'ordine* (Rome, 1922).

## CHAPTER XV

## ITALY UNDER THE SPANISH DOMINATION

§ 91.—H. HAUSER, *La prépondérance espagnole* (Paris, 1933), in the Alcan collection; B. CROCE, *Storia dell'età barocca in Italia* (Bari, 1929); V. DI TOCCO, *Ideali d'indipendenza in Italia durante la preponderanza spagnola* (Messina, 1927); D. LOTH, *Philippe II* (Paris, 1932); A. VALENTE, *Filippo II e l'Italia* (in "Nuova rivista storica," 10, 1926); C. GIARDINA, *Il Supremo Consiglio d'Italia* (in "Atti Acc. Scienze Palermo," 19, 1934); E. VERGA, *Le leggi suntuarie e la decadenza dell'industria in Milano 1563-1750* (in "Arch. stor. lomb.," 32, 1906); A. VISCONTI, *La pubblica amministrazione nello stato milanese durante le preponderanze straniere* (Milan, 1911).

§ 92.—R. RUSSO, *Sampiero Corso* (Livorno, 1932).

§ 93.—For the Savoyard State in the modern age see the comprehensive works by E. RICOTTI, *Storia della monarchia piemontese*, 6 vols. (Florence, 1861-1869), and D. CARUTTI, *Storia della diplomazia della corte di Savoia dal 1494 al 1773*, 4 vols. (Turin, 1875-1880).—For E. Ph.: A. SEGRE and P. EGIDI, *Emanuele Filiberto*, 2 vols. (Turin, 1928), and the miscellaneous volume published by the University of Turin: *Emanuele Filiberto* (Turin, 1928).

§ 94.—Misc. *Carlo Emanuele I*, 2 vols. (Turin, 1930), in the "Bibl. Soc. Stor. subalpina," 120-121; Misc. pub. by the "Ateneo Veneto," *P. S. e i suoi tempi* (Venice, 1925); L. EMERY, *Religione e politica nella mente di fra P. S.* (in "Nuova rivista storica," 8, 1924); L. V. RANKE, *Storia critica della congiura contro Venezia*, trans. from German (Capolago, 1834); A. LUZIO, *La congiura spagnola contro Venezia nel 1618* (in "Atti Ist. veneto," 1919); R. QUAZZA, *Politica europea nella questione valtellinese* (in "Nuovo archivio veneto," 42, 1921); ID., *La guerra per*

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

*la successione di Mantova e del Monferrato*, 2 vols. (Mantova, 1925-1926); ID., *Il periodo italiano della guerra dei Trenta anni* (in *Miscell. Carlo Emanuele I*, Turin, 1930).

§ 95.—M. SCHIPA, *Masaniello* (Bari, 1925).

§ 96.—See the literary histories and CROCE, § 91. In particular: P. TREVES, *La filosofia politica di T. Campanella* (Bari, 1930); F. CHABOD, *Giovanni Botero* (Rome, 1933). For the history of art (VENTURI has not yet reached the 17th century) see MÂLE. § 89. For the history of philosophy, G. DE RUGGIERO, *Storia della filosofia*, P. III, *Rinascimento riforma e controriforma*, 2 vols. (Bari, 1930); P. IV, *L'età cartesiana* (ibid. 1933). In this last volume Galileo figures.

§ 97.—E. LALOY, *La révolte de Messine, l'expédition de Sicile et la politique française en Italie*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1929-1931); C. CONTESSA, *Le negoziazioni diplomatiche per l'occupazione di Casale* (in "Riv. di storia, arte e archeologia d. prov. di Alessandria," 1896); E. CHICCA, *Ambassade du doge de Gênes à la cour de Versailles* (Lucca, 1917).

## CHAPTER XVI

### THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

§ 99.—There is a brief treatment of the period 1713-1748 in SPELLANZON (§ 106), and in M. ROSI, *L'Italia odierna*, I (Turin, 1932, 2nd ed., 2 vols.). Individual treatments: R. CASTAGNOLI, *Il cardinale Alberoni*, 2 vols. (Piacenza, 1929-1931); E. ROBIONY, *Gli ultimi dei Medici e la successione al granducato di Toscana* (Florence, 1905); D. CARUTTI, *Storia del regno di Carlo Emanuele III*, 2 vols. (Turin, 1858); N. NICOLINI, *Sulla riconquista ispano-borbonica del regno di Napoli* (in "Arch. stor. ital.," 87, 1929).

§ 100.—See the literary histories of the various countries and the third volume of *Grundriss der Gesch. d. Philosophie dell'Überweg* (Berlin, 1924, 12th ed.). General treatments of the "Enlightenment": E. CASSIRER, *La filosofia dell'illuminismo*, trans. from German (Florence, 1935).

§ 101.—See the histories of Italian literature: particularly rich in data, though insufficiently organic: G. NATALI, *Il Settecento*, 2 vols. (Milan, 1929, 3rd ed.), in st. lett. Vallardi. For Piedmont: C. CALCATERRA, *Il nostro imminente Risorgimento* (Turin, 1935).

Political doctrines: S. SALVATORELLI, *Il Pensiero politico italiano dal 1700 al 1870* (Turin, 1935), with bibliography. For economic doctrines: G. M. MONTI, *G. M. Galanti* (Campobasso, 1926); ID., *Due grandi riformatori del Settecento: A. Genovesi e G. M. Galanti* (Florence, 1926); M. R. MANFRA, *P. Verri e i problemi economici del tempo suo* (Rome, 1932); A. LISIER, *Dottrine e problemi economici*

## A CONCISE HISTORY OF ITALY

*del sec. XVIII nella vita politica e negli scrittori veneti del tempo* (in "Ateneo veneto," 110, 1932). For VICO see B. CROCE, *La filosofia da G. B. V.* (Bari, 1933, 3rd ed.).

§ 102.—For Italy of the period of reforms: there are ample data in the first volume of C. TIVARONI, *Storia critica del Risorgimento italiano*, 9 vols. (Turin, 1888–1897), a fundamental work, notwithstanding serious defects of construction. Also M. ROSI, §99; F. LEMMI, *Le origini del Risorgimento 1748–1815* (Milan, 1924, 2nd ed.); A. OMODEO, *L'età del Risorgimento italiano* (Messina, 1932). See also the sketch by G. VOLPE, *Principi di Risorgimento nel Settecento italiano* (in "Riv. stor. it.," s. 5, 1, 1936).

Individual treatments: CARUTTI (§ 99): L. VILLAT, *La Corse de 1786 à 1789*, 2 vols. (Besancon, 1925); G. VOLPE, *Come la Corsica divenne francese* (in *Momenti di storia ital.*, Florence, 1925); L. RAVENNA, *Pasquale Paoli* (Florence, 1928); E. ROTA, *L'Austria in Lombardia* (Rome, 1911); C. GRIMALDO, *G. Pisani e il suo tentativo di riforma* (Venice, 1907); U. BENASSI, *G. Du Tillot* (Parma, 1923); L. SIMEONI, *L'assorbimento austriaco del ducato estense e la politica dei duchi Rinaldo e Francesco III* (Modena); A. ZOBÌ, *Storia civile della Toscana dal 1737 al 1848*, 5 vols. (Florence, 1850–1852); A. ANZILOTTI, *Il tramonto dello stato cittadino e le riforme in Toscana nella seconda metà del sec. XVIII* (in *Movimenti e contrasti per l'unità italiana*, Bari, 1930); F. BALDASSERONI, *Il rinnovamento civile in Toscana* (Florence, 1931); M. SCHIPA, *Il regno di Napoli al tempo di Carlo III di Borbone*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1923); A. SIMEONI, *Le origine del Risorgimento politico dell'Italia Meridionale*, 2 vols. (Messina, 1925–1931); E. PONTIERI, *Il tramonto del baronaggio siciliano* (in "Archivio storico siciliano," 51–53, 1931–1933). Cf. the indications as to religious conditions.

For religious conditions: A. C. JEMOLO, *Il giansenismo in Italia prima della rivoluzione* (Bari, 1928), with the bibliographical indications: ID., *Italia religiosa nel Settecento* (in "Rivista storica italiana," 49, 1932); M. TORTONESE, *La politica ecclesiastica di Carlo Emanuele III* (Florence, 1910); A. M. BETTANINI, *Benedetto XIV e la repubblica di Venezia* (Milan, 1931); F. SCADUTO, *Stato e chiesa in Toscana sotto Leopoldo I* (Florence, 1885); G. ONNIS, *B. Tanucci nel moto anticurialista del Settecento* (in "Nuova Rivista storica," 10, 1926); B. CROCE, *Studi sulla vita religiosa a Napoli nel Settecento* (in *Uomini e cose della vecchia Italia*, II, Bari, 1927); E. PONTIERI, *Il viceré Caracciolo e la suppressione del Santo Ufficio in Sicilia* (in "Archivio stor. Sic.," 49–49, 1928).

For the economic conditions: L. EINAUDI, *La finanza sabauda all'aprirsi del secolo XVIII e durante la guerra di successione spagnola* (Turin, 1908); C. PRATO, *La vita economica in Piemonte a mezzo il sec. XVIII* (Turin, 1908); ID., *L'evoluzione agricola nel secolo XVIII e le cause economiche dei moti del 1792–1793 in Piemonte* (ibid. 1909); S. PUGLIESE, *Condizioni economiche e finanziarie della Lombardia nella prima metà del sec. XVIII* (in "Miscell. di stor. ital.," 52, 1924); C. A. VIANELLO, *L'industria, il commercio e l'agricoltura dello stato di Milano nella seconda metà del sec. XVIII* (Como, 1932); L. EINAUDI, *L'economia pubblica di Venezia dal 1735 al 1755* (in *Studi di economia e finanza*, Turin, 1907); R. GESSI, *La crisi agricola negli stati veneti a metà del sec. XVIII* (in "Nuovo Arch. veneto,"

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

42, 1921); C. BARBAGALLO, *Le origini della grande industria contemporanea*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1929-1930).

## CHAPTER XVII

### FROM THE REVOLUTION TO THE RESTORATION

§ 103.—For the Revolutionary and Napoleonic period the fullest collection of data is now to be found in TIVARONI (§ 102), II-III. A good exposition will be found in A. FRANCHETTI, *Storia d'Italia dal 1789 al 1799*, 2nd ed., F. LEMMI (Milan, 1907, in the Collezione Vallardi), and SPELLANZON (§ 106), I.

Individual treatments: N. BIANCHI, *Storia della monarchia piemontese dal 1773 al 1861*, 4 vols. (Turin, 1877-1885); D. CARUTTI, *Storia della corte di Savoia durante la rivoluzione e l'impero francese*, 2 vols. (Turin, 1892); G. PESSAGNO, *Genova sotto la rivoluzione e l'impero* (in "Boll. stor.-bibl. subalpino," 19, 1914); G. CONTI, *La Toscana e la rivoluzione francese* (Florence, 1924); A. DUFOURCQ, *Le régime jacobin en Italie. Etude sur la République romaine* (Paris, 1900); B. CROCE, *La rivoluzione napoletana del 1799* (Bari, 1926, 4th ed.), a collection of essays; A. PINGAUD, *La politique italienne de Napoléon I* (in "Revue Historique," 154, 1917); A. SOLMI, *Napoleone e l'Italia* (in *Discorsi sulla storia d'Italia*, Florence, 1934); C. ZAGHI, *Bonaparte e la rep. cispadana* (in "Riv. st. it.," s. 5, 2, 1937); F. BATTAGLIA, *L'opera di V. Cuoco e la formazione dello spirito nazionale in Italia* (Florence, 1926); A. SOLMI, *L'idea dell'unità italiana nell'età napoleonica* (in "Rassegna stor. del Risorg.," 20, 1933); R. SÒRIGA, *Giornali e spirito pubblico, in Milano sulla fine del sec. XVIII* (in "Rivista d'Italia," 1916); G. CATTANI, *Il giansenismo e la legislazione ecclesiastica della Cisalpina* (in "Nuova rivista stor.," 15, 1931).

§ 104.—There is a very useful collection of data in the chronicle-history of A. COMANDINI (finished by A. MONTI), *L'Italia nei cento anni del sec. XIX giorno per giorno*, illustrated, 4 vols. pub. (Milan, 1900). A comprehensive exposition: V. FIORINI and F. LEMMI, *Storia d'Italia dal 1799 al 1814* (Milan, 1918, in the Collezione Vallardi).

Individual treatments: E. DRIAULT, *Napoléon en Italie 1800-1812* (Paris, 1906); E. TARLE, *Le blocus continental et le royaume d'Italie. La situation économique de l'Italie sous Napoléon I* (Paris, 1928); L. CORACCINI, *Storia dell'amministrazione del regno d'Italia durante il dominio francese* (Lugano, 1823); A. PINGAUD, *Bonaparte président de la république italienne*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1907-1908); ID., *Les hommes d'Etat de la répub. ital.* (Paris, 1919); ID., *Le premier royaume d'Italie* (in "Revue des études napoléoniennes," 20-21 (1923), 25 (1925), and in "Revue d'histoire diplomatique," 40-44 (1926-1930), 46-47 (1932-1933)); P. MARMOTTAN, *Le royaume d'Etrurie* (Paris, 1895); I. RINIERI, *La diplomazia pontificia nel sec. XIX*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1902); ID., *Napoleone e Pio VII*, 2 vols. (Turin, 1906); ID., *Pio VII e Napoleone nel 1814* (Genova, 1914); F. LEMMI, *Roma nell'impero napoleonico*



(in "Arch. stor. ital.," 1915); L. MADELIN, *La Rome de Napoléon* (Paris, 1927), 4th ed.; P. PIERI, *Il regno di Napoli dal 1799 al 1806* (Napoli, 1928); J. RAMBAUD, *Naples sous Joseph Bonaparte* (Paris, 1911); A. ESPITALIER, *Napoléon et le roi Murat* (Paris, 1910); G. BIANCO, *La Sicilia durante l'occupazione inglese* (Palermo, 1902).

On the Italian army in the Napoleonic period: *Gli italiani in Russia nel 1812 e gli Italiani in Germania nel 1813*, by the Historical Office of the General Staff (Rome, 1912-1913).

For Freemasonry during the Napoleonic period: A. LUZIO, *La massoneria sotto il regno italico e la restaurazione austriaca* (in "Arch. stor. lomb.," 44, 1917); R. SÒRIGA, *Settecento massonizzante e massonismo napoleonico nel primo risorgimento* (in "Boll. stor. Pavese," 19, 1919). Cf. § 106.

§ 105.—M. H. WEILL, *J. Murat, La dernière année de règne*, 5 vols. (Paris, 1909-1910); F. LEMMI, *La restaurazione austriaca a Milano* (Bologna, 1902); ID., *G. Murat e le aspirazioni unitarie del 1815* (in "Arch. stor. napol.," 26, 1911).

On European politics as affecting Italy: N. BIANCHI, *Storia documentata della diplomazia europea in Italia dal 1814 al 1861*, 8 vols. Turin, 1865-1872); I. RINIERI, *La diplomazia etc.* (§ 104); G. VOLPE, *I rapporti diplomatici fra l'Italia e l'Europa durante il Risorgimento* (in "Bulletin of International Committee of Hist. Sciences," V, 1933); W. SCHWARZ, *Die heilige Allianz* (Stuttgart, 1935); H. SRBIK, *Metternich*, 2 vols. (Munich, 1925), and on the other side: V. BIBL, *Metternich in neuer Beleuchtung* (Vienna, 1928); N. ROSSELLI, *La politica inglese in Italia n. età del Risorg.* (in "Riv. stor. it.," 3, 5, 1, 1936).

§ 106.—An ample collection of data for the period 1815-1870 will be found in TIVARONI (§ 102), IV-VI (*L' Italia sotto il dominio austriaco*) and VII-IX (*L' Italia degli Italiani*). Histories of the period: I. RAULICH, *Storia del Risorgimento politico dell'Italia*, 5 vols. (Bologna, 1920-1925), coming down to 1849 only, without critical discussion or bibliography; shorter expositions in ROSI (§ 99); H. BOLTON KING, *The Story of Italian Unity*; F. QUINTAVALLE, *Storia dell'unità italiana 1815-1925* (Milan, 1926, 2nd ed.). Above all, fundamental for 1815-1848 (the work is in process of publication) C. SPELLANZON, *Storia del Risorgimento italiano* (Milan, 1933 ff.), in which critical use is made of the whole bibliography and the printed documents (with abundant textual quotations) and sometimes of unpublished documents.

Important as a document of political polemics, Republican in tendency, rather than as a critical historical exposition: ORIANI (see Bibl.).

For the period of the restoration: N. BIANCHI, *I ducati estensi 1815-1850*, 2 vols. (Turin, 1852); A. SARDI, *Lucca e il suo ducato 1814-1859* (Pistoia, 1912); P. PIERI, *La restaurazione in Toscana 1814-1921* (Pisa, 1822); L. C. FARINI, *Lo stato romano 1815-1850*, 4 vols. (Turin, 1850-1853); G. CASSI, *Il card. Consalvi e i primi atti della restaurazione pontificia* (Rome, 1931); W. MATURI, *Il concordato del 1818 tra la Santa Sede e le Due Sicilie* (Florence, 1928); A. SANDONÀ, *Il regno lombardoveneto. La costituzione e la amministrazione* (Milan, 1912).

Liberal movements: G. FERRARI, *I partiti politici italiani dal 1789 al 1848* (re-

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

printed by Città di Castello, 1921); A. MONTI, *L'idea federalista nel Risorgimento italiano* (Bari, 1921); K. ROBERTS GREENFIELD, *Economics and Liberalism in the Risorgimento. A study of nationalism in Lombardy 1814-1848* (Baltimore, 1934); N. CORTESE, *Il liberalismo toscano nei primi quarant'anni del secolo XIX* (in "Rassegna nazionale," July 1921); P. MAZARA, *Studio sul movimento liberale in Sicilia dal 1815 alla vigilia del 1848* (Alcamo, 1916). For Italian political thought: G. DE RUGGIERO, *Storia del liberalismo europeo* (Bari, 1925); SALVATORELLI (§ 100). On journalism: A. DRESLER, *Geschichte der ital. Presse*, 2, T., 1815-1900 (Munich, 1934). Secret societies: A. LUZIO: *La massoneria e il Risorgimento*, 2 vols. (Bologna, 1925); G. LETI, *Carbonerie e Massoneria nel Risorgimento italiano* (Rome, 1925); SORIGA (§ 104); P. PIERI, *Le società segrete e i moti degli anni 1820-1821 and 1830-1831* (Milan, 1931); A. BERSANO, *Adelfi, Federati e Carbonari* (in "Atti Acc. Scienze Torino," 45, 1909-1910); G. DE CASTRO, *Milano e le cospirazioni lombarde 1814-1820* (Milan, 1892); A. BARETTA, *Le società segrete in Toscana nel primo decennio dopo la restaurazione* (Turin, 1911); G. DEGLI AZZI VITELLISCHI, *Bonapartisti, Massoni e Carbonari nell'Umbria dopo la restaurazione pontifica* (in "Arch. stor. del Risorgim. Umbro," 1-2, 1905-1906); D. SPADONI, *Sette, cospirazioni e cospiratori nello stato pontificio all'indomani della restaurazione* (Turin, 1904); B. MARCOLONGO, *Le origini della Carboneria e le società segrete nell'Italia Meridionale dal 1810 al 1820* (in "Studi storici," 20, 1912); V. LABATE, *Un decennio di Carboneria in Sicilia 1821-1831*, vol. 2 (Città di Castello, 1904-1909).

On "Conciliators": C. CANTÙ, *Il Consiliatore e i Carbonari* (Milan, 1878); E. CLERICI, *Il Consiliatore* (in "Annali della R. Sc. Normale di Pisa," 1902).

## CHAPTER XVIII

### THE RISORGIMENTO

§ 107.—A. ALBERTI, *La rivoluzione napoletana, il suo parlamento e la reazione europea* (Rome, 1931); V. CASTALDO, *La rivoluzione napoletana del 1820* (in "Rassegna stor. del Risorg.," 8, 1921); V. FONTANAROSA, *Il parlamento nazionale napoletano 1820-1821* (Rome, 1900); Miscell. *La rivoluzione piemontese del 1821* (Turin, 1921).

There is no adequate monograph on Charles Albert. For the period preceding the kingdom see N. RODOLICO, *Carlo Alberto principe di Carignano* (Florence, 1931).

§ 108.—A. LUZIO, *A. Salvotti e i processi del Ventuno* (Rome, 1901); ID., *Il processo Pellico-Maroncelli* (Milan, 1903); ID., *Nuovi documenti sul processo Confalonieri* (Rome, 1908); A. SANDONA, *Contributo alla storia dei processi del '21 e dello Spielberg* (Turin, 1911); M. PERLINI, *I processi politici del card. Rivarola* (Mantua, 1910).

§ 109.—P. SILVA, *La monarchia de luglio e l'Italia* (Turin, 1917); C. VIDAL, *Louis-Philippe, Metternich et la crise italienne de 1831* (Paris, 1931); ID., *Louis-Philippe, Mazzini et la Jeune Italie 1832-1834* (Paris, 1934); T. FONTANA, *Don Giuseppe Andreoli* (Reggio Emilia, 1924); G. RUFFINI, *Le cospirazioni del 1831 nelle memorie di Enrico Misley* (Bologna, 1931).

The best account of the Estense conspiracy is in SPELLANZON, II.

G. SFORZA, *La rivoluzione del 1831 nel ducato di Modena* (Parma, 1909); A. DEL PRATO, *L'anno 1831 negli ex-ducato di Parma, Piacenza e Guastalla* (in "Memorie parmensi per la storia del Risorg.," II, 1919); R. DEL PIANO, *Roma e la rivoluzione del 1831* (Rome, 1931).

§ 110.—There is no fully adequate biography of Mazzini. See BOLTON KING, *Mazzini*; G. O. GRIFFITH, *Mazzini, The Prophet of a new Europe*. A. LUZIO, *M. carbonaro* (Turin, 1920); ID., *Carlo Alberto e Mazzini* (Turin, 1923). For Mazzini's political ideas, see SALVATORELLI (§ 100).

G. FALDELLA, *I fratelli Ruffini. Storia della Giovine Italia* (Turin, 1895-1897); I. GRASSI, *Il primo periodo della Giovine Italia nel Grand. di Toscana* ("Riv. stor. Risorgimento ital.," 2, 1897); ID., *La G. I. e le congreghe delle Marche nel 1833* (in "Rivista d'Italia," I, 1907); E. MICHEL, *F. D. Guerrazzi e le cospirazioni politiche in Toscana 1830-1835* (Rome, 1904).

For the reign of Charles Albert before 1848 see N. RODOLICO, *Carlo Alberto negli anni di regno 1831-1843* (Florence, 1936). For the beginnings of the kingdom: F. LEMMI, *La politica estera di Carlo Alberto nei suoi primi anni di regno* (Florence, 1928). For the trials of '33 see SPELLANZON, II, against recent reactionary histories. For Garibaldi § 112.—For the other Italian States in the period 1830-1846 see F. GUARDIONE, *Il dominio dei Borboni in Sicilia dal 1830 al 1861*, 2 vols. (Turin, 1907, 2nd ed.); H. WEIL, *Les troubles de Bologne et leur répercussion: sept., oct. 1843* (in "Atti e mem. Deputazione Romagna," 3, 4, 1924); O. MONTENOVESI, *I casi di Romagna: settembre 1845* (in "Rass. stor. Risorg.," 8, 1921); R. PIER-ANTONI, *Storia dei fratelli Bandiera* (Milan, 1909).

§ 111.—P. PRUNAS, *L'Antologia di G. P. Vieusseux* (Rome, 1906); R. CIASCA, *L'origine del programma per l'opinione nazionale italiana del 1847-1848* (Città di Castello, 1915); A. ANZILOTTI, *Dal neoguelfismo all'idea liberale* (in "Nuova rivista storica," I, 1917); E. PORCELLI, *L'agitazione liberale toscana studiata nelle filze segrete della polizia del Buon Governo 1844-1846* (Palermo, 1919); A. SANDONÀ, *L'idea unitaria e i partiti politici alla vigilia del 1848* (Rome, 1914); A. ANZILOTTI, *La funzione storica del giobertismo* (Florence, 1924).

For Italian literature of the time the fullest inventory is in G. MAZZONI, *L'Ottocento*, 2 vols. (Milan, 1934, 3rd ed.), in *Storia letteraria Vallardi*.

For scientific congresses, which served the ends of patriotic agitation: A. HORTIS, *Le riunioni degli scienziati italiani prima della guerra d'indipendenza* (Città di Castello, 1922); R. CESSI, *Retrosceca politici del primo congresso degli scienziati italiani* (in "Rassegna stor. Risorgimento, 10, 1923).

§ 112.—A. GORI, *Storia della rivoluzione italiana nel periodo delle riforme* (Florence,

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1897); R. GIOVAGNOLI, *Ciceruacchio e don Pirlone. Ricordi storici della rivoluzione romana dal 1846 al 1849* (Rome, 1894); C. LOVERA and I. RINIERI, *Clemente Solaro della Margherita* (Turin, 1931), apologetic; G. PRATO, *L'associazione agraria subalpina e C. Cavour* (in "Biblioteca di st. it. recent," 9, 1921); ID., *La metamorfosi economica e sociale del Piemonte di Carlo Alberto* (in "Nuova riv. stor.," 4, 1920); E. PASSAMONTI, *Il giornalismo giobertiano in Torino nel 1847-1848* (Rome, 1914); A. COLOMBO, *I due giornali torinesi il "Risorgimento" e la "Concordia"* (in "Risorgimento italiano," 3, 1910).

For an exact appreciation of the policy of Pius IX, see SPELLANZON, III, and L. SALVATORELLI, *Pio IX e il Risorgimento* (in "Lavoro" di Genova, 2 ottobre 1936).

A. COLOMBO, *Dalle riforme all statuto di Carlo Alberto* (Casale, 1926); G. MARANINI, *Le origini dello statuto albertino* (Florence, 1925).

§ 113.—G. M. TREVELYAN, *Manin and the Venetian revolution 1848-1849* (London, 1923); G. C. CLERICI, *La suprema reggenza e il governo provvisorio di Parma nel 1848* (in "Arch. stor. per le provincie parmensi," N.S., 16, 1916).

For an exact understanding of the circumstances of Piedmont's entry into the war see SPELLANZON, III.

On the question of the volunteers in 1848 and their relation to the Piedmont command, see the contradictory treatments of L. C. BOLLEA and A. MONTI in "Nuova riv. storica," 10, 1926.

A good and detailed biography of Garibaldi is G. SACERDOTE (Milan, 1933).

§ 114.—C. SCAVONE, *Il movimento unitario repubblicano in Toscana nel '48-'49* (Catania, 1918); I. BAIONE LELLI, *La costituente italiana nel 1849* (Florence, 1920); A. GORI, *Gli albori del socialismo 1755-1848* (Florence, 1919); and on the same subject: N. ROSSELLI, C. Pisacane (Turin, 1932), c. VII.

G. PALADINO, *Il 15 maggio 1848 in Napoli* (Rome, 1921); ID., *Il governo napoleonico e la guerra del 1848* (in "Nuova riv. stor.," 2-5, 1920-1921); C. DE DONATO, *Il moto liberale napoletano del 1848* (Bari, 1930); L. LEDERMANN, *Pellegrino Rossi* (Paris, 1829); G. LETI, *La rivoluzione e la repubblica romana* (Milan, 1913); G. BAIONE, *La costituente toscana* (in "Rass. stor. Risorg.," 5, 1918); I. BONOMI, *G. Mazzini triumviro della Repubblica Romana* (Turin, 1936); G. M. TREVELYAN, *Garibaldi's Defence of the Roman Republic* (London, 1920, 2nd ed.); A. UGOLETTI, *Brescia nella rivoluzione del 1848-1849* (Bologna, 1899).

For European politics respecting Italy in this period: A. J. TAYLOR, *The Italian Problem in European Diplomacy 1847-1849* (Manchester, 1934).

## CHAPTER XIX

### THE FORMATION OF THE UNITARY STATE

§ 115.—A. LUZIO, *I matiri di Belfiore* (Milan, 1924, 4th ed.); L. POLLINI, *L'insurrezione milanese del 1853* (Milan, 1930); E. CASA, *Parma, da Maria Luigia a Vittorio Emanuele II 1847-1860* (Parma, 1901); G. LUMBROSO, *Austria e Toscana*

dopo la restaurazione del 1849 (in "Rass. stor. Risorg.," 19, 1932); A. M. BETTANINI, *Il concordato di Toscana* (Milan, 1932), and against the semi-Curialistic thesis of this author, M. PUCCIONI, *Il concordato di Toscana* (in "Miscell. st. d. Valdelsa," 41, 1933); R. DE CESARE, *Roma e lo stato del papa dal ritorno di Pio IX al XX settembre*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1907); G. LETI, *Roma e lo stato pontificio dal 1849 al 1870*, 2 vols. (Ascoli Piceno, 1911, 2nd ed.); L. GROTANELLI, *I moti politici nelle Marche e nella Romagna dal 1848 al 1852* (in "Rassegna nazionale," 1903-1904); B. RONCHI, *Movimento politico della città di Perugia dal 1848 al 1860* (Foligno, 1904); E. COSTANTINI, *Il decennio di occupazione austriaca in Ancona* (Ancona, 1916); G. PALADINO, *Il processo per la setta "L'unità italiana" e la reazione borbonica dopo il '48* (Florence, 1928); M. MAZZIOTTI, *La reazione borbonica nel regno di Napoli 1849-1860* (Rome, 1913).

T. BUTTINI, *La destra liberale e conservatrice nel 1849: luglio-novembre* (in "Il Risorg. it.," 17, 1924); G. ARANGIO-RUIZ, *Storia costituzionale del regno d'Italia 1848-1898* (Florence, 1898); S. CILIBRIZZI, *Storia parlamentare politica e diplomatica d'Italia da Novara a Vittorio Veneto*, 4 vols. (Milan, 1923-1930).

There is no adequate biography of Victor Emmanuel II, and none will be possible until certain archives are opened. But a useful book is G. MASSARI's *La vita ed il regno di V. E. II*, 2 vols. (Milan, 1878). See M. ROSI, *V. E. II*, 2 vols. (Bologna, 1930).

P. MATTER, *Cavour et l'unité italienne*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1926-1927); G. CAPPA, *Cavour* (Bari, 1932), apologetic biography; F. RUFFINI, *La giovinezza del conte di Cavour*, 2 vols. (Turin, 1902; reprinted, 1938). For Cavour's policy, see A. OMODEO, in the Introductions to the new edition of the *Discorsi parlamentari* (Florence, 1932 ff.), and in "Critica," 32, 1934, ff.

A. BOZZOLA and T. BUTTINI, *Stato e chiesa nel regno di Sardegna negli anni 1849-1850* (in "Il Risorg. it.," 14, 1921); A. C. JEMOLO, *Il partito cattolico piemontese nel 1855 e la legge sarda di soppressione delle comunità religiose* (ibid., 11, 1918-1919); P. SILVA, *La politica di Napoleone III e l'Italia* (in "Nuova riv. st.," 11, 1927); A. PINGAUD, *Napoleon III et ses projets de confédération italienne* (in "Revue historique," 155, 1927). For the Crimean War see A. OMODEO, *Mazzini e Cavour*, in "Critica," 1936. For Pisacane, see ROSELLI (§ 114). On Cattaneo and Ferrari see SALVATORELLI (§ 101) with bibl. For their relations with Mazzini after 1848: A. MONTI, *Un dramma fra gli esuli* (Milan, 1921).

§ 116.—A. LUZIO, *Felice Orsini* (Milan, 1914); R. CADDEO, *L'attentato Orsini* (Milan, 1933); B. M. SUMMER, *The Secret Franco-Russian Treaty of March 3, 1859* (in "English Historical Review," 48, 1933); C. PAGANI, *Milano e la Lombardia nel 1859* (Milan, 1902); F. DE DOMINICIS, *L'ordinamento provvisorio della Lombardia nel 1859* (in "Risorg. ital.," 4, 1911); T. MARCHI, *La formazione storico-giuridica dello stato italiano. I, Le annessioni della Lombardia e degli stati dell'Italia centrale* (Parma, 1924); M. PUCCIONI, *L'unità d'Italia nel pensiero e nell'azione del barone Bettino Ricasoli. Storia documentata della rivoluzione liberale in Toscana* (Florence, 1932); N. ROSELLI, *G. Montanelli e il problema toscano nel 1859* (in "Arch. stor. it.," 94, 1936); J. TRÉSAL, *L'annexion de la Savoie à la France* (Paris, 1914); G. GIACOMETTI, *La question de l'annexion de Nice en 1860* (in "Revue des Deux Mondes," 1 March 1896).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

§ 117.—A. OMODEO, *Il conte di Cavour a la questione romana* (in "La Nuova Italia," I, 1930); L. SALVATORELLI, *Il pensiero e l'azione di Cavour per la questione romana* (in "La Cultura," N.S., 9, 1930); R. DE CESARE, *La fine di un regno* [Naples], 2 vols. (Città di Castello, 1900); G. M. TREVELYAN, *Garibaldi and the Thousand*; I. NAZZARI MICHELI, *Cavour e Garibaldi nel 1860* (Rome, 1911); L. C. BOLLEA, *Cavour e la spedizione delle Marche* (in "Il Risorg. ital.," 10, 1917).

§ 118.—General: R. MICHELS, *Italien von heute. Politische u Wirtschaftliche Kulturgeschichte 1860–1930* (Zurich, 1930); R. DE CESARE, *Mezzo secolo di storia italiana sino alla pace di Losanna* (Città di Castello, 1913, 3rd ed.); Miscell. *Cinquanta anni di storia italiana*, 3 vols., Milan, 1911, pub. by the Acc. dei Lincei: G. PALADINO, *Storia d'Italia dal 1861 al 1871, con particolare riguardo alla questione romana* (Milan, 1933). And on the same subject (also for the preceding and following periods), H. BASTGEN, *Die römische Frage*, 3 vols. (Freiburg i. Br., 1917–1918); G. MOLLAT, *La question romaine, De Pie VI à Pie XI* (Paris, 1932).

Special works: F. GUARDIONE, *Aspromonte* (Parlermo, 1923, 2nd ed.); A. LUZIO, *Aspromonte e Mentana* (Florence, 1935); L. M. CASE, *Franco-italian Relations 1860–1865. The Roman Question and the convention of September* (Philadelphia, 1932); A. SANDONA, *Il Trentino e l'alleanza italo-prussiana del 1866* (in "Nuova Antologia," 50, 1915).

## CHAPTER XX

### ITALY AFTER 1870

§ 119.—B. CROCE, *Storia d'Italia dal 1871 al 1915* (Bari, 1928, 3rd ed.); G. VOLPE, *Italia in cammino* (Milan, 1929, 3rd ed.). Of general interest for the period see: G. GIOLITTI, *Memorie della mia vita*, 2 vols. (Milan, 1922), and L. LUZZATTI, *Memorie* (2 vols. hitherto pub., down to 1900) (Bologna, 1931–1935).—(See also DRESLER (§ 106), 3. T., 1900–1935.)

§ 120.—A. FERRARI, *Principi e forme della lotta politica nella terza Italia* (Rome, 1927); F. BATTAGLIA, *Lo stato etico e l'ideologia politica della Destra liberale* (in "Civiltà moderna," I, 1929); E. TAGLIACOZZO, *Silvio Spaventa e la politica della Destra* (in "Nuova Riv. stor.," 16, 1932); S. IACINI, *Un conservatore rurale della Nuova Italia*, S. Iacini (Bari, 1926); A. FERRARI, *Destra e Sinistra 1871–1881* (in "Rass. stor. Risorg.," 13, 1926); N. ROSSELLI, *Mazzini e Bakounine* (Turin, 1927), for the beginnings of Socialism: P. VIAZZI, *Il partito repubblicano* (Genoa, 1913).

§ 121.—There is no adequate monograph on Leo XIII; a very defective work is that by the clerical E. SODERINI, *L. XIII* (Milan, 1932–1933), 3 vols.; F. SALATA, *Per la storia diplomatica della questione romana* (Milan, 1929); C. CRISPOLTI and G. AURELI, *La politica di Leone XIII da Luigi Galimberti a Mariano Rampolla* (Rome, 1912); V. PROCACCI, *La questione romana: Le vicende del tentativo di conciliazione del 1887* (Florence, 1929).

A. SANDONÀ, *L'irredentismo nelle lotte pol. e nelle contese dipl. italo-aust.*, I, 1866-1882 (Bologna, 1932); L. SALVATORELLI, *La Triplice Alleanza*, articles appearing in the "Rassegna di politica internazionale," 3-4, 1936-1937, which will be collected in volume form, and which contain essential bibliographical references; H. GRANFELD, *Das Dreibund-System 1879-1916* (Berlin, 1925); A. BILLOT, *Histoire des années troubles 1881-1899*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1905); R. CIASCA, *Storia coloniale dell'Italia contemporanea* (Milan, 1938).

A. PLEBANO, *Storia della finanza italiana dalla costituzione del nuovo regno alla fine del sec. XIX*, 3 vols. (Turin, 1899-1902); V. PORRI, *L'evoluzione economica italiana dell'ultimo cinquantennio* (Turin, 1926); R. MORANDI, *Storia della grande industria italiana* (Bari, 1932); G. FORTUNATO, *Il Mezzogiorno e lo stato italiano*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1926, 2nd ed.); L. FRANCHETTI and S. SONNINO, *La Sicilia* (Florence, 1925, 2nd ed.); B. G. BRENNA, *Storia dell'emigrazione italiana* (Rome, 1928).

R. MICHELS, *Storia critica del movimento socialista italiano* (Florence, 1926); I. BONOMI, *L. Bissolati e il movimento socialista in Italia* (Milan, 1928); R. RIGOLA, *R. R. e il movimento operaio nel Biellese. Autobiografia* (Bari, 1930); M. BETTINOTTI, *Venti anni di movimento operaio genovese* (Milan, 1932); G. ZIBORDI, *Camillo Prampolini e i lavoratori reggiani* (Bari, 1930).

§ 122.—For the literary history of the period the essays of B. CROCE are of fundamental importance: *La Letteratura della Nuova Italia*, 4 vols. (Bari, 1929, 3rd ed.). For general culture, the essays of G. GENTILE on Sicily and Piedmont in "Critica," 1909-1911, 1915-1923, and of G. BROGNOLIGO on the Veneto, *ibid.*, 1919-1924; also L. RUSSO, *F. De Sanctis e la cultura napoletana* (Florence, 1928).

§ 123.—There is no critical monograph on Crispi. See G. CASTELLINI, *Crispi* (Florence, 1915); G. VOLPE, *Crispi* (Venice, 1928).

§ 124.—M. MISSIROLI, *La monarchia socialista* (Bologna, 1921, 2nd ed.); F. PAPAFAVA, *Dieci anni di vita italiana: 1899-1909*, 2 vols. (Bari, 1909); F. S. NITTI, *Il partito radicale* (Turin, 1907); E. VERCESI, *Il movimento cattolico in Italia: 1870-1922* (Florence, 1923).

§ 125.—L. BISSOLATI, *La politica estera dell'Italia: 1897-1920* (Milan, 1923); S. BARZILAI, *Dalla Triplice Alleanza al conflitto europeo* (Rome, 1924); is of great importance in respect of the diplomatic material summarized and analysed. F. TOMMASINI, *L'Italia alla vigilia della guerra. La pol. est. di T. Tittoni*, (Bologna, 1934-1937), down to the beginning of 1908. For Tripoli see GIOLITTI, *Memorie* (§ 119), II, and the articles by A. TORRE, *La preparazione diplomatica dell'impresa libica*, appearing in "Rassegna di politica internazionale," IV, 1937.

§ 126.—G. SALVEMINI, *Dal patto di Londra alla pace di Roma* (Turin, 1925); M. TOSCANO, *Il patto di Londra* (Pavia, 1931); A. VALLORI, *La condotta politica della guerra* (Milano, 1934); L. SALVATORELLI, *La politica della Santa Sede dopo*

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

*la guerra* (Milan, 1937), c. I with bibl.; A. VALORI, *La guerra italo-austriaca* (Bologna, 1925, 2nd ed.); R. BENCIVENGA, *Saggio critico sulla nostra guerra* (Bari, 1930); A. FERRARI, *Partiti ed uomini politici italiani nella guerra mondiale* (in "Nuova riv. stor.," 14, 1930); L. EINAUDI, *La condotta economica e gli effetti sociali della guerra italiana* (Bari, 1933).

§ 127.—For the post-war period, as no true history is possible, it is impracticable to compile a historico-critical bibliography. For chronicle-histories or political polemics, see the bibliography of the article *Italia Storia*, and that of the article *Fascismo* in *Enciclopedia italiana*.





## INDEX OF NAMES

- Abelard, Pierre, 179  
 Acacius, 68, 75  
 Accursio, Francesco, 213  
 Accursio, Francesco, son, 278  
 Achaia, Philip of, 249  
 Acton, Admiral, 488  
 Adalbert, King of Italy, 133-4  
 Adalbert, Marquis of Ivrea, 130  
 Adalbert of Tuscany, 130-1, 133  
 Adaloald, 93  
 Adelaide, Empress, 133  
 Adelaide, Marchioness of Turin, 199  
 Adelasia, 232  
 Adelchi, King of the Lombards, 105  
 Adelchi, Prince of Benevento, 121  
 Adhemar of Puy, 155  
 Adolphus of Nassau, King of Germany,  
     249, 256  
 Adorno, Antoniotto, 307  
 Agathocles, 32  
 Agathon, Pope, 100  
 Agilulf, 92-3, 99  
 Agnello, Giovanni d', 290, 299  
 Agostino di Duccio, 353  
 Agrippa, Henricus Cornelius von Nettes-  
     heim, 395  
 Agrippa, M. Vipsanius, 56  
 Aistulf, 103-4  
 Alagona, Velasco, d', 309  
 Alamanni, Luigi, 389  
 Alaric, 65, 74, 78  
 Alaric II, King of the Visigoths, 74  
 Alba, Ferdinand, Duke of, 407  
 Albani, Francesco, 447  
 Alberic I of Spoleto, 131-2  
 Alberic II of Spoleto, 132-3  
 Alberoni, Card. Giulio, 458  
 Albertano of Brescia, 210  
 Albertario, Don Davide, 607  
 Alberti, Leon Battista, 351-2  
 Albert of Habsburg, King of Germany,  
     258  
 Albinos, 76  
 Albizzi family, 330-1  
 Alboin, 89-90  
 Alborno, Card. Egidio, 291-7  
 Albret, Charlotte d', 370  
 Alcuin, 115  
 Aldobrandini, Card. Pietro, 425  
 Aleardi, Aleardo, 597  
 Alembert, Jean d', 464, 468  
 Aleramo, 126  
 Alessandro de' Medici, Duke of Florence,  
     385, 402-3  
 Alessi, Giuseppe, 442  
 Alexander II, Pope, Anselm, Bishop of  
     Lucca, 148  
 Alexander III, 186, 188, 190  
 Alexander IV, 234  
 Alexander V, 320  
 Alexander VI, 342, 365, 367, 369-74  
 Alexander VII, 442, 450  
 Alexander VIII, 450  
 Alexander I, Tsar of Russia, 509, 511  
 Alexander II, Tsar of Russia, 565  
 Alexander, Molossus, 574  
 Alexius I, Comnenus, Emperor of the  
     East, 178  
 Alexius IV, Angelus, 225  
 Alexius V, 225  
 Alfieri, Vittorio, 475-6  
 Alfonso I, King of Naples, Alfonso V,  
     King of Aragon, 327, 331-5, 341  
 Alfonso I, of Este, Duke of Ferrara,  
     382-3  
 Alfonso II, 347, 366  
 Alfonso II, d'Este, 425  
 Alfonso III, King of Aragon, 247  
 Alfonso X, of Castile, King of the  
     Romans, 242  
 Alighieri, Dante, 251-2, 255-6, 258-260,  
     282  
 Ali Pasha, 413  
 Allvinczy, Nicholas, 494  
 Altichiero, of Verona, 286  
 Amadeo, Giovanni Antonio, 353  
 Amalaric, 74  
 Amalasuntha, Queen of the Lombards,  
     75-8  
 Amari, Michele, 543

- Ambrose, Saint, 63, 65  
Amedeus V, Count of Savoy, 305  
Amedeus VI, 299-300, 305-6, 547  
Amedeus VII, 305  
Amedeus VIII, Count, then Duke of Savoy  
(anti-pope under the name of  
Felix V), 317, 323, 332, 336, 401, 430  
Amedeus IX, 344  
Ammirato, Scipione, 445  
Anacletus II, antipope, 175-6  
Anastasius I, Emperor of the East, 70,  
74-5  
Anastasius II, Pope, 73  
Andrea of Hungary, King of Naples,  
308-9  
Andreoli, Don Giuseppe, 530  
Andronicus II, Palaeologus, Emperor of  
the East, 249, 253  
Angelico, Fra (Giovanni da Fiesole), 352  
Angiolieri, Cecco, 283  
Anjou: for the Kings of Sicily and Naples  
and Hungary, *see* individual names  
Anjou, Beatrice of, 243  
Anjou, Charles of, Duke of Calabria,  
262, 271  
Anjou, John of, 341-2  
Anjou, Philip of, 454  
Anne Stuart, Queen of England, 454  
Annese, Gennaro, 441  
Anselm of Aosta, Saint, 175  
Anselm of Lucca, 153  
Ansperto, 122  
Antelami, Benedetto, 208  
Antonelli, Card. Giacomo, 552, 558, 562  
Antonello, Messina da, 354-5  
Antoninus Pius, 55, 58  
Antonio Farnese, Duke of Parma, 458  
Antony, Mark, 51, 52  
Antony of Padua, Saint, 209  
Appiani, Andrea, 545  
Appiano, Gherardo d', 314  
Appiano, Jacopo I d', 314  
Appiano, Jacopo IV d', 372  
Apuleius, 46, 56  
Aquinas, St. Thomas, 277-8  
Archidamos of Sparta, 25  
Arcimatteo di Salerno, 213  
Arcos, Duke of, 440  
Ardigo, Roberto, 601  
Arduin of Ivrea, 138  
Aretino, Pietro, 389  
Arialdo, 148  
Aricchi, 119  
Ariold, 93  
Ariosto, Ludovico, 388-9  
Aripert, 93-4  
Aristippus, Enricus, 214  
Aristodemus, 23  
Aristotle, 213-14, 355, 449  
Armagnac, Comte d', 312  
Armagnac, Louis d', 373-4  
Armellini, Carlo, 557-8  
Arnold of Brescia, 179-180, 182-3, 217  
Arnolfo di Cambio, 284-5  
Arnulf, King of Germania, 128-9  
Arnulf of Carinthia, 122  
Arquati, Francesco, 581  
Arrigo di Settimello, 211  
Athalaric, 76-7  
Attila, 65  
Augustine, Saint, 222  
Augustus, Emperor, 24, 49, 51, 52, 53,  
55, 57, 60  
Augustus III, Elector of Saxony, King of  
Poland, 459, 460  
Aurelian, Emperor, 61  
Austria, Don John of, son of Charles V,  
413  
Austria, Don John of, son of Philip IV,  
441  
Authari, 92  
Avalos, Alfonso d', Marquis del Vasto,  
381  
Avalos, Ferdinando d', Marquis of Pes-  
cara, 381  
Avicenna, 214  
Azzone, 212  
Baccarini, Giovanni, 592, 594  
Bach, Johann Sebastian, 478  
Baciccia, 447  
Baciocchi, Elisa, 503  
Bacon, Francis, 356  
Badoglio, Pietro, 627  
Baglioni, Gian Paolo, 379  
Baglioni, Malatesta, 384-5  
Baibars, Sultan of Egypt, 251  
Bakunin, Michael, 589  
Balbo, Cesare, 540, 543, 547, 549, 555  
Balbo, Prospero, 511, 557  
Balboa, Vasco Nunez di, 361  
Baldo, 278

# INDEX OF NAMES

- Baldwin II, of Flanders, Emperor of Constantinople, 225, 243
- Balilla, 401
- Bandello, Matteo, 390
- Bandiera, Attilio, 538-9
- Bandiera, Emilio, 531, 538-9
- Bandiera, Francesco, 531, 538-9
- Baratieri, Oreste, 605-6
- Barbarigo, Agostino, 413
- Barbarossa, Khairuddin, 400, 402-3, 412
- Barbavara, Francesco, 315
- Barberini, Taddeo, 438
- Barbiano, Alberico da, 303, 313, 315
- Baretti, Giuseppe, 473, 484
- Barnaba of Modena, 286
- Baroncelli, Francesco, 295
- Baronio, Cesare, 445
- Barozzi, Jacopo, 446
- Barrère, Camille, 614
- Bartoli, Adolfo, 600
- Bartoli, Daniello, 446
- Bartolini, Lorenzo, 545
- Bartolo da Sassoferrato, 264, 278
- Bartolomeo da Messina, 214
- Bartolomeo da Neocastro, 279
- Bartolomeo da San Concordia, 278
- Bartolomeo della Porta, 393
- Barzellotti, Giacomo, 601
- Basil I, Emperor of the East, 121
- Basil II, 123
- Bassville, Hugues, 491, 503
- Baton, Pompeo, 477
- Baumgarten, Anichino, 271, 290
- Bava Beccaris, Florence, 607
- Bayard, 381
- Beatrice of Burgundy, 181
- Beatrice of Provence, 235
- Beatrice of Tuscany, 146
- Beauharnais, Alexander, 492
- Beauharnais, Eugène, 502, 504-5
- Beaulieu, Jean Pierre, 492
- Beccaria, Cesare, 471
- Becque, Henry, 599
- Bedmar, Alfonso, Marchese di, 436
- Belcari, Feo, 351
- Belisarius, 78-80, 84, 332
- Bella, Giano della, 251-2, 256
- Bellarmino, Card. Robert, 411
- Bellay, Joachim du, 391
- Bellegarde, Henri, 499, 505
- Belli, Gioacchino, 542
- Bellini, Gentile, 355
- Bellini, Giovanni, 355
- Bellini, Vincenzo, 546
- Belotto, Bernardino, 477
- Bembo, Pietro, 387-8
- Benedetto da Maiano, 352
- Benedict of Aniane, 114
- Benedict V, Pope, 134
- Benedict VIII, 139-140
- Benedict IX, 144
- Benedict X, 146
- Benedict XI, 258
- Benedict XII, 293
- Benedict XIII, 303, 321
- Benedict XIV, 485
- Benedict XV, 625
- Benedict of Norcia, Saint, 86-8
- Benelli, Sem, 611
- Bentinck, Lord William, 505-6
- Bentivoglio, Guido, 446
- Bentivoglio, John I, 314
- Bentivoglio, John II, 372-3
- Benvenuti, Card. G. A., 531
- Benvenuti, Pietro, 545
- Berchet, Jean, 541
- Berengarius I, 128-32
- Berengarius II, 132-4
- Bergognone (Ambrogio da Fossano), 355
- Bernard, King of Italy, 117-18
- Bernard of Clairvaux, Saint, 153-4, 175, 179-180
- Bernardone, Pietro, 220
- Bernetti, Card. Tommaso, 532
- Berni, Francesco, 389
- Bernini, Gian Lorenzo, 447
- Bertani, Agostino, 589
- Berthier, Alexandre, 495-6
- Berthollet, Claude Louis, 484
- Bessarione, Card. Giovanni, 349
- Beust, Count Ferdinand von, 582
- Bibbiena, Bernardo Dovizi, *detto il*, 389
- Bini, Carlo, 535
- Biondo, Flavio, 350
- Bisceglie, Alfonso di, 372
- Bismarck, Otto von, 578, 591, 593, 603
- Bissolati, Leonida, 609
- Bistolfi, Leonardo, 612
- Blasi, Francesco Paolo di, 490
- Bobadilla, Francesco di, 360
- Boccaccio, Giovanni, 282-4, 351
- Boccalini, Traiano, 445

- Boccanegra, Guglielmo, 240  
 Boccanegra, Simone, 287-8  
 Boccheciampe, Pietro, 539  
 Bodoni, G. B., 484  
 Boetius (M. T. Anicius Severinus), 72-3,  
     76  
 Bohemond of Antioch, 155, 176  
 Boiardo, Matteo Maria, 351  
 Boito, Arrigo, 597, 602  
 Bon, Bartolomeo, 353-4  
 Bon, Giovanni, 353-4  
 Bona of Savoy, Duchess of Milan, 344  
 Bonaccolsi, Pinamonte de', 249  
 Bonaccorso, 220  
 Bonaventura di Bagnorea (Saint), 277-8  
 Boncompagni, Carlo, 571  
 Boncompagni, Jacopo, 424  
 Boncompagno da Signa, 211  
 Bonello, 187  
 Bonfigli, Benedetto, 354  
 Bonghi, Ruggero, 591  
 Boniface VIII, Pope, 255-8  
 Boniface IX, 303, 315, 318-19  
 Boniface of Canossa, 146  
 Boniface of Monferrato, 224-5  
 Bonifacio, San, 229  
 Bonomini, Francesco, 447  
 Bononi, 622  
 Borelli, Vincenzo, 531  
 Borghini, Vincenzo, 445  
 Borgia family, 342  
 Borgia, Caesar, 365, 370-4  
 Borgia, Giovanni, 365  
 Borgia, Jofrè, 365, 370  
 Borgia, Lucrezia, 365  
 Borgia, Pier Luigi, 342  
 Borgia, Rodrigo, 342  
 Borgognone (Ambrogio da Tossano),  
     117  
 Borsieri, Pietro, 526-7  
 Borso d'Este, Duke of Ferrara, 336  
 Boscán, Juan, 391  
 Boselli, Paolo, 618  
 Bossuet, Benigne, 444  
 Botero, Giovanni, 445  
 Botta, Carlo, 493, 543  
 Botta Adorno, Antonio, 461  
 Borticelli, Sandro, 352  
 Boucher, François, 477  
 Boucicault (Jean Le Maingre), 313, 317  
 Boulanger, 602  
 Bourbon, Charles, Constable of, 381-2  
 Braccio da Montone, 320-1  
 Bracciolini, Poggio, 349, 350  
 Bracco, Roberto, 611  
 Bradley, James, 464  
 Bragadino, Marcantonio, 413  
 Bramante, Donato, 392  
 Brancalone, 234  
 Bregno, Andrea, 354  
 Brienne, Walter (Gautier) of, Duke of  
     Athens, *see* Walter  
 Brune, Guillaume, 499  
 Brunelleschi, Filippo, 352  
 Bruni, Leonardo, 349, 350, 351  
 Bruno, Giordano, 425, 449, 603  
 Brutus, M. Junius, 52  
 Bubna, Ferdinand Anton von, 524,  
     527  
 Buffon, Georges-Louis de, 464, 468  
 Bulgarus, 185  
 Buonaiuti, Ernesto, 612  
 Buonarroti, Filippo, 489  
 Buonarroti, Michelangelo, 384, 388, 392-  
     393, 398, 447  
 Buonvicini, Fra Domenico, 369-70  
 Buoso di Dovara, 234, 242  
 Burchiello, 350  
 Burgundio of Pisa, 214  
 Burlamacchi, Francesco, 404  
 Buschetto, 172  
 Bussolari, Jacopo, 291  
 Butlinus, 80  
 Buttillo, Francesco, 310  
 Cabral, Pedro Alvarez, 362  
 Cabot, John, 362  
 Cabot, Sebastian, 362  
 Cadorna, Luigi, 617, 619  
 Cadorna, Raffaello, 583  
 Caesar, Julius, 49, 51, 53  
 Caesar, Lucius Julius, 47  
 Caetani, Giacomo, 280  
 Caetani, Onorato, 319  
 Caffaro, 210  
 Cafiero, Carlo, 592  
 Cairoli, Benedetto, 592-4  
 Cairoli, Enrico, 581  
 Cairoli, Giovanni, 581  
 Calandra, Davide, 612  
 Calcondila, Demetrio, 349  
 Calderón de la Barca, Pedro, 444

# INDEX OF NAMES

- Caldora, Jacopo, 327  
 Caligula, Emperor, 55  
 Calixtus II, Pope, 152  
 Calixtus III, Antipope,  
 Calixtus III, Pope, 187, 340-2, 365  
 Calvi, Pier Fortunato, 554, 562  
 Calvin, 398, 400  
 Camerana, Giovanni, 597  
 Campanella, Tommaso, 417, 449  
 Campofregoso, Pietro di, 341  
 Camuccini, Vincenzo, 545  
 Canale, Antonio, 477  
 Canaletto (*see* Canale and Belotto)  
 Cane, Facino, 313, 317-18  
 Canonica, Pietro, 612  
 Canosa, Antonio Capece Minutolo, Prince  
 of, 518  
 Canossa, Beatrice of, 146  
 Canossa, Boniface of, 146  
 Canossa, Matilda of, 150-2, 168, 174, 176  
 Canova, Antonio, 477, 545  
 Canozzi, 552  
 Cantoni, Carlo, 601  
 Cantù, Cesare, 542  
 Capello, Bianca, 427  
 Capello, Vittor, 340  
 Cappellini, Alfredo, 579  
 Capponi, Gino, 543, 558  
 Capponi, Nicolò, 384  
 Capponi, Piero, 366  
 Caprivi, Leo von, 603  
 Caracalla, Emperor, 55, 59  
 Caracciolo, Domenico, 488  
 Caracciolo, Francesco, 498  
 Caracciolo, Giovanni, 327  
 Carafa, Pietro, 399  
 Carascosa, Michele, 522  
 Caravaggio (Michelangelo Amerighi), 447  
 Cardano, Gerolamo (Cardanus), 395  
 Carducci, Giosuè, 599  
 Carli, Gian Rinaldo, 471  
 Carloman, son of Charles Martel, 103  
 Carloman, son of Pippin the Short, 105  
 Carloman, son of Louis the German, 105  
 Carlos, Don, son of Philip V, *see*  
 Charles III of Spain  
 Carmagnola, Francesco Bussone, *detto* il  
 conte di, 322-4  
 Carnesecchi, Pietro, 410  
 Caronda, 19  
 Carpaccio, Vittor, 355  
 Carracci, Agostino, 447  
 Carracci, Annibale, 447  
 Carracci, Ludovico, 447  
 Carrara, Francesco il Vecchio of, 289,  
 312, 316  
 Carrara, Francesco Novello of, 297, 306,  
 312, 316  
 Carrara, Marsilio I of, 267  
 Carrara, Marsilio II of, 329  
 Carrara, Ubertino of, 267  
 Carrer, Luigi, 542  
 Cartier, Jacques, 362  
 Caruffini, Federico, 601  
 Casa, Giovanni della, 388, 391  
 Casati, Gabrio, 551, 555  
 Casella, Alfredo, 612  
 Casimir-Périer, 531  
 Cassiodorus, Senator, 72-3, 76, 88  
 Cassius, Longinus (C), 52  
 Castagno, Andrea del, 352  
 Castelnovo-Tedesco, Mario, 612  
 Castiglione, Baldassare, 391  
 Castracani degli Interminelli, Castruccio,  
 261-2, 264-5  
 Catalani, Alfredo, 602  
 Catherine of Habsburg, 433, 454  
 Catherine dei Medici, 401  
 Catherine of Siena, Saint, 283, 301-2  
 Catilina, L. Sergius, 50, 51  
 Catinat, Nicolas de, 452, 454  
 Cato, the Elder, M. Porcius, 42  
 Cattaneo, Carlo, 551, 567, 601  
 Catullus, G. Valerius, 53, 54  
 Cavalca, Domenico, 283  
 Cavalcanti, Guido, 280  
 Cavalieri, Emilio de', 478  
 Cavalli, Francesco, 446, 478  
 Cavallini, Pietro, 285  
 Cavallotti, Felice, 606  
 Cavour, Count Camillo Benso di, 563,  
 575, 588  
 Caxton, 357  
 Cecchi, Gianmaria, 389  
 Cecco d'Ascoli, 282  
 Celestine III, Pope, 193  
 Celestine IV, Pope, 232  
 Celestine V, Pope, 255  
 Cenci, Beatrice, 425  
 Cernuschi, Enrico, 551  
 Cervantes, Miguel de, 444  
 Cesare d'Este, Duke of Modena, 425

- Cesari, Antonio, 543  
 Chambord, Henri de Bourbon, Conte de, 562  
 Championnet, Stefano, 497  
 Chantel, Giovanni, 489  
 Charlemagne, King of the Franks, Emperor, 105, 111-17, 282  
 Charles of Durazzo, 318  
 Charles III, the Fat, King of Swabia and Emperor, 122, 128  
 Charles IV, Emperor, 265, 288-291, 294, 299  
 Charles V, Emperor, King of Spain, 379-383, 396-7, 400-7  
 Charles VI, Emperor, 458, 460  
 Charles VII, Charles Albert, Emperor, Elector of Bavaria, 460, 462  
 Charles I, Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary, 619  
 Charles II, the Bald, King of France, 118, 122-4  
 Charles IV of France, 263  
 Charles V, 310  
 Charles VI, 313  
 Charles VII, 341  
 Charles VIII, 334, 337, 364, 366-8, 370, 385  
 Charles X, *prima* Conte d'Artois, 490, 529  
 Charles I, of Anjou, King of Sicily, 235-236, 241-7  
 Charles II, the Lame, King of Sicily, 246-7, 255, 259  
 Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, 379  
 Charles II, Duke of Modena (Charles Louis, Duke of Lucca), 503, 507, 512, 549, 552  
 Charles III, Duke of Modena, 562  
 Charles III, King of Naples, 310  
 Charles II, King of Spain, 454-5  
 Charles III, King of Spain, *prima* King of Naples and Sicily, 458-61, 481, 488  
 Charles III, Duke of Savoy, 383, 401  
 Charles Albert, King of Sardinia, 522-4, 528-9, 535, 543, 546-9, 552-6, 558, 560  
 Charles Emmanuel I, Duke of Savoy, 433-7  
 Charles Emmanuel II, 451-2  
 Charles Emmanuel III, King of Sardinia, 459, 461, 483-4  
 Charles Emmanuel IV, 484, 495-6, 505  
 Charles Felix, King of Sardinia, 523-4, 529, 535  
 Charles Martel, 103, 113  
 Chaucer, Geoffrey, 357  
 Cherubini, Luigi, 545  
 Chiabrera, Gabriello, 444  
 Chiapelli, Alessandro, 601  
 Childebert II, King of Austrasia, 92  
 Christian, Archbishop of Mainz, 189, 215  
 Christine of France, Duchess of Savoy, Madame Reale, 438  
 Christine of Lorraine, Duchess of Tuscany, 427  
 Chrzanowsky, Adalbert, 557-8  
 Cialdini, Enrico, 573, 578-9  
 Ciardi, Guglielmo, 611  
 Cibo, Franceschetto, 347-8  
 Cicero, M. Tullius, 50, 52, 53, 55, 349  
 Cima da Conegliano, 355  
 Cimabue, 285  
 Cimarosa, Domenico, 478  
 Cincius, Alimentus, 42  
 Cinna, Cornelius, 48  
 Cino da Pistoia, 264, 278, 282  
 Cinzica dei Sismondi, 169  
 Cinzio, Giambattista, 389  
 Cipriani, Leonetto, 571  
 Cirillo, Domenico, 498  
 Clara, Saint, 222  
 Claudius, Tib. Drusus, Emperor, 55, 57  
 Claudius II, Emperor, 61  
 Clement II, Pope, 144  
 Clement III, 150-1, 193  
 Clement III, Antipope, 150-1  
 Clement IV, 235, 245  
 Clement V, 258, 260, 262  
 Clement VI, 293  
 Clement VII, 303, 310, 380, 396-7, 401  
 Clement VII, Antipope, Card. Robert of Geneva, 302-3, 310  
 Clement VIII, 425, 433  
 Clement XIII, 481-2, 485  
 Clement XIV, 482, 485  
 Cleonymus, 25  
 Cleopatra, 52  
 Cleph, 90  
 Clovis, 74-5, 90

# INDEX OF NAMES

- Cola di Rienzo, 293-7, 335  
 Colet, John, 357  
 Collegno, Giacinto di, 522  
 Colleoni, Bartolomeo, 334, 343  
 Colletta, Pietro, 521, 543  
 Colli, Luigi,  
 Colombo, Matteo, 395  
 Colonna, Card. Giacomo, 256  
 Colonna, Card. Pietro, 256  
 Colonna, Fabrizio, 373  
 Colonna, Marcantonio, 413  
 Colonna, Prospero, 373, 380  
 Colonna, Sciarra, 257, 264  
 Colonna, Stefano, 293  
 Colonna, Vittoria, 388, 398  
 Columban, Saint, 88  
 Columbus, Christopher, 360-1  
 Commodius, Emperor, 55  
 Commynes, Philippes de, 357  
 Compagni, Dino, 282-3  
 Condillac, Etienne de, 468  
 Confalonieri, Casati Teresa, 527  
 Confalonieri, Federico, 518, 524, 527  
 Conforti, Francesco, 498  
 Conrad II, Emperor, 140-2, 144  
 Conrad III, Emperor, 175, 177, 180-1  
 Conrad IV, 233-4  
 Conrad V, Corradino, 234-5, 238  
 Conrad of Spoleto, 194  
 Conrad, son of Henry IV, Emperor,  
     151  
 Consalvi, Card. Ercole, 507, 513, 528  
 Constance, daughter of Manfred, 235  
 Constance of Sicily, 192  
 Constans II, 93, 100  
 Constantine IV, 100  
 Constantine IV, Pogonatus, 100  
 Constantine, the Great, Emperor, 55, 61,  
     62, 63, 104  
 Constance d'Hauteville, 196  
 Constance of Hohenstaufen, Queen of  
     Aragon, 235  
 Contarini, Card. Gaspare, 399  
 Contarini, Carlo, 482  
 Contarini, Domenico, Doge, 173, 254  
 Copernicus, Nicholas, 356, 395  
 Coppino, Michele, 592  
 Cornaro, Caterina, Queen of Cyprus, 341  
 Corneille, Pierre, 444  
 Corradino, 234-6, 245  
 Correggio, Antonio Allegri, *detto* il, 393  
 Correnti, Cesare, 551  
 Corsini, Neri, 512  
 Cortez, Fernando, 361  
 Corti, Luigi, 593  
 Cosa, Giovanni de la, 361  
 Cosimo I, Duke of Florence, *then* Grand  
     Duke of Tuscany, 403, 406-8, 425-6  
 Cosimo II, 434, 438  
 Cosimo III, 459  
 Cossa, Francesco del, 355  
 Cossa, Pietro, 598  
 Costa, Andrea, 590  
 Cotta, Giovanni, 387  
 Courtenay, Philip de, 243  
 Crassus, M. Licinius, 48, 50, 51  
 Cremona, Tranquillo, 601  
 Crescenzi, the, 136, 144  
 Crescenzo, Giovanni I, 136  
 Crescenzo, Giovanni II, 139  
 Crispi, Francesco, 572, 590, 592, 594,  
     603-6  
 Cristiani, Beltrame, 485  
 Croce, Benedetto, 612  
 Cromwell, Oliver, 451  
 Cronaca, Il, 352  
 Cunimpert, 94  
 Cuoco, Vincenzo, 504  
 Curio, Caelius Secundus, 398  
 Cusanus, Nicholas, 357  
 Cybo, Maria Teresa, 485  
 Daddi, Bernardo, 286  
 Damasius, Pope, 65  
 Damasius II, 145  
 D'Ancona, Alessandro, 600  
 Dandolo, Andrea, 253, 279  
 Dandolo, Enrico, Doge, 224-5  
 D'Annunzio, Gabriele, 599-600, 610-11,  
     620  
 Dante, 251  
 D'Aspre, Constantino, 558  
 David, Louis, 477  
 Davidovic, Paul von, 493  
 Davila, Enrico Caterino, 445  
 D'Azeglio, Massimo, 540, 542, 545, 547,  
     560, 563  
 Dazzi, Arturo, 612  
 De Amicis, Edmondo, 598  
 De Andreis, Luigi, 607  
 De Deo, Emanuele, 489  
 De Felice-Giuffrida, Giuseppe, 605



- De la Tour, 523  
 Del Carretto, Francesco Saverio, 526, 538  
 De Leva, Giuseppe, 600  
 Della Rocca, Enrico Morozzo, 573  
 Della Rovere, Giovanni, 345  
 De Luca, Canon Antonio, 525-6  
 Denina, Carlo, 484  
 Depretis, Agostino, 573, 589, 591-4, 596, 602-3  
 D'Ercole, Pasquale, 601  
 De Rolandis, G. B., 489  
 Desaix, Louis, 498-9  
 De Sanctis, Francesco, 544, 600  
 De Sanctis, Francesco, architect, 476  
 De Sanctis, Gaetano, 16, 17, 612  
 Descartes, René, 449  
 Desiderio da Settignano, 351  
 Desiderius, King of the Lombards, 104-5  
 De Stefanis, Francesco, 489  
 Deusdedit, Card., 153  
 Deux, Card. Bertrand de, 294-5  
 Diavolo, Michele Pezza, *detto* Fra, 498  
 Diaz, Armando, 619  
 Diaz, Bartolomeo, 360  
 Diderot, Denis, 468-9  
 Diepold of Acerra, 197  
 Diocles, 19  
 Diocletian, Emperor, 55, 61, 62, 65  
 Dionysius the Elder, 24  
 Dionysius the Younger, 25  
 Diotsalvi, 207  
 Di San Giuliano, Antonino, 615, 617  
 Dolci, Carlo, 448  
 Domenichino (Domenico Zampieri), 447  
 Dominic, Saint, 222  
 Domitian, Emperor, 55  
 Donatello, 351  
 Donizetti, Gaetano, 546  
 Donizone, 174  
 Doria, Andrea, 382, 402, 404, 427  
 Doria, Filippino, 382  
 Doria, Gian Andrea, 413, 428  
 Doria, Giannettino, 404, 428  
 Doria, Lamba, 253  
 Drogo d'Hauteville, 142-3  
 Drusus, M. Livius, 46  
 Duccio da Boninsegna, 285  
 Ducetius, 24  
 Dungalo, 116  
 Duprè, Jean, 545  
 Durando, Giovanni, 552, 554  
 Durante, 282  
 Durante, Francesco, 478  
 Dürer, Albrecht, 394  
 Duse, Eleanora, 599  
 Du Tillot, Guillaume, 487  
 Eckhart, Johann, *detto* Meister, 326  
 Eleonora, Duchess of Florence, 426  
 Eleonora of Toledo, 426  
 Elias, Frate, 221  
 Elisabetta Farnese, Queen of Spain, 458  
 Emmanuel, Philibert, Duke of Savoy, 407-8, 429-433  
 Emo, Angelo, 482  
 Empedocles, 20  
 Ennius, 42  
 Ennodius, 73  
 Enzo, King of Sardinia, 233  
 Epicharmus, 20  
 Epiphanius, Saint, 72-3  
 Erasmus, Desiderius, 357  
 Ercole I, d'Este, Duke of Ferrara, 344, 346, 372, 376, 378  
 Ercole, Rinaldo III, d'Este, Duke of Modena, 462, 485  
 Erlembaldo, 148  
 Ermengarde, 105  
 Ermengarde, Marchioness of Ivrea, 131  
 Este, Alfonso d', 372  
 Este, Azzo d', 198, 232  
 Este, Azzo VIII d', 249  
 Este, Beatrice d', 485  
 Este, Nicolò d', 297  
 Este, Obizzo II d', 250  
 Este, Obizzo III d', 286  
 Este, *for the Dukes of Ferrara and Modena, see individual names*  
 Euclid, 214  
 Eugenius III, Pope, 179-80  
 Eugenius IV, 328-9, 331, 333  
 Euphemius of Messina, 120  
 Euric, 68  
 Eutharic, husband of Amalasuntha, 75-6  
 Ezzelino II, 198  
 Ezzelino III, 230, 233-4, 240  
 Faà di Bruno, Emilio, 579  
 Fabbri, Odoardo, 556  
 Fabius Pictor, 42  
 Facta, Luigi, 622  
 Faggiuola, Uguccone della, 261

# INDEX OF NAMES

- Falcando, Ugo, 210  
 Faliero, Marino, Doge, 289  
 Fanti, Manfredo, 571, 574  
 Farini Luigi Carlo, 535, 547, 569, 570-1, 577  
 Farnese, *see the individual names of sovereigns*  
 Faruffini, Federico, 601  
 Fattori, Giovanni, 601  
 Fava, Guido, 211  
 Febronus, Johann Nikolaus von Hont-heim, *detto*, 481  
 Felipe, Don, son of Philip V, *see* Philip, Duke of Parma  
 Felix IV, Pope, 76  
 Felix V, Antipope, *see* Amedeo VIII  
 Fénelon, François de la Mothe, 444  
 Ferdinand I, Emperor, 380, 407  
 Ferdinand I (Ferrante), King of Naples, 341-3, 345-6, 348, 365-6  
 Ferdinand II, Ferrandino, 368  
 Ferdinand I, King of Aragon and Sicily, 322, 327  
 Ferdinand the Catholic, King of Aragon and Sicily, 360, 364, 367, 371, 374, 376, 379  
 Ferdinand I, King of the Two Sicilies, Ferdinand IV, King of Naples, 481, 488, 491, 497, 502, 505-7 513-14, 518, 525, 549, 558  
 Ferdinand II, 537-8, 553, 562, 572  
 Ferdinand I, Emperor of Austria, 537, 555  
 Ferdinand I, Grand Duke of Tuscany, 427, 433-5  
 Ferdinand II, 438, 442, 459  
 Ferdinand III, 491, 507, 512, 524  
 Ferdinand VII, King of Spain, 520  
 Ferdinand, Duke of Genoa, 556  
 Ferdinand Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua, 435  
 Ferdinand Charles Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua, 454  
 Ferdinand, Duke of Parma, 481, 502  
 Ferrari, Giuseppe, 567, 601  
 Ferrari, Paolo, 599  
 Ferreto da Vicenza, 280  
 Ferrucci, Francesco, 384-5  
 Fiamma, Galvaneo, 279  
 Ficino, Marsilio, 349, 356  
 Fieschi, Gian Luigi, 404-5  
 Filangeri, Gaetano, 471-2, 488  
 Filarete, 353  
 Filelfo, Francesco, 349, 350  
 Filicaia, Vincenzo da, 445  
 Fiorentino, Francesco, 601  
 Fiorenzo di Lorenzo, 354  
 Firmian, Carlo Giuseppe, 485  
 Flaminio, Marcantonio, 387  
 Flamma, Galvaneo, 279  
 Flavius, 55  
 Fogazzaro, Antonio, 598  
 Foix, Gaston de, *see also* Germaine de Foix, 377  
 Fonseca, Pimentel, Eleonora, 495  
 Fontana, Domenico, 447  
 Fontanesi, Antonio, 601  
 Foppa, Vincenzo, 355  
 Formosus, Pope, 129-30  
 Fortebraccio, Braccio, 327  
 Fortebraccio, Nicolò, 324, 328-9  
 Forteguerra, Nicolò, 474  
 Fortis, Leone, 590, 613  
 Foscari, Francesco, Doge, 323-4  
 Foscolo, Ugo, 493, 503  
 Fossombroni, Vittorio, 512  
 Fracastoro, Gerolamo, 387  
 Fragonard, Jean-Honoré, 477  
 Francesca, Piero della, 352, 354  
 Francesco I, Sforza, Duke of Milan, *prima* Count Francesco Sforza, 335, 342, 353, 401  
 Francesco II, Sforza, Duke of Milan, 380-1, 383  
 Francesco Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua, 435  
 Francesco Vanezzo di, 283  
 Francesco, Giacinto, Duke of Savoy, 438  
 Francesco di Medici, Grand Duke of Tuscany, 426-7  
 Francia, Francesco Raibolini, *detto* il, 393  
 Francis II, Holy Roman Emperor, Francis I, Emperor of Austria, 462, 499, 502, 537  
 Francis I, King of the Two Sicilies, 542  
 Francis I, King of France, 378-83, 397, 401-4, 406  
 Francis II of Naples, 572-4, 576  
 Francis III, Duke of Modena, 484, 506, 511-12  
 Francis IV, 529, 531-2  
 Francis V, 532, 552, 569  
 Francis of Assisi, Saint, 211, 220-22, 283  
 Francis Joseph, Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary, 555, 570, 574, 591

- Franco, General, 627-8  
 Frangipane, Giovanni, 236  
 Frederick, King of the Rugii, 69  
 Frederick of Aragon, King of Naples, 368, 371  
 Frederick of Austria, King of Germany, 260  
 Frederick of Hohenstaufen, 175  
 Frederick I, Barbarossa, Emperor, 181-93, 219  
 Frederick I, of Aragon, King of Sicily, 247, 256, 259, 271  
 Frederick II, King of Prussia, 462  
 Frederick II, King of Sicily and Emperor, 196-9, 211-12, 219, 227-34, 280, 321  
 Frederick III, Emperor, 334-6  
 Frederick III, of Aragon, King of Sicily, 276, 309, 321  
 Frundsberg, Georg von, 382  
 Fuga, Ferdinando, 476  
  
 Gaddi, Taddeo, 286  
 Gaetano di Thiene, Saint, 399  
 Galeazzo Maria Sforza, Duke of Milan, 344  
 Galiani, Ferdinando, 471  
 Galilei, Alessandro, 476  
 Galilei, Galileo, 356, 445, 448  
 Galla, Placidia, 83  
 Galletti, Giuseppe, 556  
 Galliano, Giuseppe, 605  
 Gallienus, Emperor, 60  
 Gallina, Giacinto, 599  
 Gallo, Tommaso, 209, 278  
 Galluppi, Pasquale, 544  
 Gambacorta, Giovanni, 316  
 Gambacorta, Piero, 299  
 Garcilaso de La Vega, 392  
 Garelli, Giacomo, 526  
 Garibaldi, Anita, 560  
 Garibaldi, Giuseppe, 555, 559-60, 568, 572-4, 576, 580-1, 589  
 Gattamelata, Erasmo di Narni, *detto il*, 351  
 Gaudentius, Saint, 64  
 Gaysruck, Card. Gaetano, 548  
 Gelasius, Pope, 73  
 Gelon, 23  
 Genoino, Giulio, 440  
 Genovesi, Antonio, 471, 488  
 Genseric, 65, 68  
 Gentile da Fabriano, 354  
 Gentile, Giovanni, 612  
 Gentiloni, Vincenzo Ottorino, 610  
 George III, King of England, 492  
 George IV, 510  
 Gerard of Cremona, 213-14  
 Gerberga, 105  
 Germaine de Foix, Queen of Aragon, 374  
 Gero, 23  
 Gherardesca, Ugolino della, 251  
 Ghiberti, Lorenzo, 351  
 Ghirlandaio, Domenico, 352  
 Giacosa, Giuseppe, 599  
 Gian Galeazzo Sforza, Duke of Milan, 344, 353  
 Gian Gastone, Grand Duke of Tuscany, 459  
 Gianni, Francesco, 486  
 Giannone, Pietro, 472  
 Giacchino di Fiore, 209  
 Gioberti, Vincenzo, 536, 539, 544, 547, 557  
 Gioia, Melchiorre, 493, 504  
 Giolitti, Giovanni, 597, 604, 606-7, 613, 615-17, 620-1, 623  
 Giordani, Pietro, 544  
 Giordano, Umberto, 612  
 Giorgione, Giorgio Barbarelli, *detto*, 393-4  
 Giotto, 284-6  
 Giovanna, *see* Joanna  
 Giovanni I, Marquis of Monferrato, 198  
 Giovanni, II Marquis of Monferrato, 242, 244, 248-9, 300, 305  
 Giovanni di Andrea del Mugello, 278  
 Giovanni di Cermenate, 279  
 Giovanni, Fiorentino, 283  
 Giovanni da Gubbio, 208  
 Giovanni Maria Visconti, Duke of Milan, 315, 317  
 Giovanni di Pian del Carpine, 280  
 Giovanni da Procida, 246  
 Giovanni da Schio, 230  
 Giovanni di Verazzano, 362  
 Giovio, Paolo, 387  
 Giusti, Giuseppe, 542  
 Giustiniani, Giovanni Guglielmo, 340  
 Gladstone, William Ewart, 563  
 Gluck, Christopher, 478  
 Godfrey of Bouillon, 155  
 Godfrey of Lorraine, 146  
 Goffredo da Castiglione, 148  
 Goffredo di Viterbo, 210

# INDEX OF NAMES

- Gola, Emilio, 611  
Goldoni, Carlo, 474-5  
Góngora, Luigi di, 444  
Gonzaga, *for the Dukes of Mantua, see individual names*  
Gonzaga, Feltrino, 297  
Gonzaga, Ferrante, 405, 436  
Gonzaga, Ferrante, Prince of Guastalla, 436  
Gonzaga, Francesco II, Marquis of Mantua, 367  
Gonzaga, Gian Francesco, Marquis of Mantua, 376  
Gonzaga, Giulia, 398  
Gonzaga, Luigi I, 267  
Gonzaga-Nevers, Charles de, 436  
Gonzalo de Cordoba, 374  
Gorgias, 20  
Gozzano, Guido, 611  
Gozzi, Gaspere, 473  
Gozzoli, Benozzo, 352  
Gracchus, G. Sempronius, 44, 45  
Gracchus, Tib. Sempronius, 44  
Gratianus, 153, 213  
Grazioli, Don Bartolomeo, 561  
Grazzini, Antonfrancesco, 389  
Gregory of Rimini, 278  
Gregory I, the Great, Pope, 86, 92-3, 98-100  
Gregory II, 101-2  
Gregory III, 102-3  
Gregory V, 136  
Gregory VI, 144, 149  
Gregory VII, Ildebrando di Soana, 149-151, 154  
Gregory VIII, Alberto di Benevento, 213  
Gregory IX, Card. Ugolino di Ostia, 213, 219, 221, 229-32, 278  
Gregory X, 243-4  
Gregory XI, 300-2, 318  
Gregory XII, 303, 319-21  
Gregory XIII, 424, 430  
Gregory XVI, 528, 531, 547  
Grimaldi, Antonio, 288  
Grimoald, King of the Longobards, 93-4  
Grimoald, Duke of Benevento, 119  
Grossi, Tommaso, 542  
Guaimar, IV Prince of Salerno, 142-3  
Gualbert, St. John, 145  
Guarco, Nicolò di, 289, 307  
Guardabassi, Francesco, 535  
Guardi, Francesco, 477  
Guariento of Padua, 286  
Guarini, 390  
Guelf VI, Marquis of Tuscany, Duke of Spoleto, 181, 189  
Guerrazzi, Francesco Domenico, 535, 542, 557-8  
Guglielmo d' Assisi, 209  
Guglielmo VII of Monferrato, 198, 242, 244, 248-9  
Guibert of Ravenna, 150  
Guicciardini, Francesco, 390  
Guidiccioni, Giovanni, 388  
Guido, Archbishop of Milan, 148  
Guido, Marquis of Tuscany, 131-2  
Guido of Spoleto, Emperor, 122, 128-9  
Gunizelli, Guido, 280  
Guise, Henry II of Lorraine, Duke of, 441  
Guise, Francis of Lorraine, Duke of, 407-8  
Guittone d'Arezzo, 280  
Gundeberga, 93  
Gundobad, 74  
Gutenberg, Johann, 357  
Gyulai, Franz, 568-9  
Habsburg, *for the Emperors and Grand Dukes of Tuscany, see individual names; for natural sons of the Kings of Spain, see under Austria*  
Habsburg, Archduke Albert of, 579  
Habsburg, Archduke Charles of, 454-5, 494, 502  
Habsburg, Archduke Ferdinand of, 435  
Habsburg, Archduke Ferdinand of, 485  
Habsburg, Archduke Francis Ferdinand of, 616  
Habsburg, Archduke John of, 499  
Habsburg, Archduke Ranier of, 546  
Hadrian I, Pope, 105, 107  
Hadrian IV, 183-4, 186  
Hadrian VI, 380, 399  
Hadrian, Emperor, 55, 56, 57, 58  
Handel, George Frederick, 478  
Hannibal, 39  
Hasdrubal, 39  
Hauteville family, 142  
Haury, René-Just, 464  
Hawkwood, Sir John, 277, 290, 298, 302, 313

- Haydn, Joseph, 479  
 Hayez, Francesco, 545  
 Haynau, Julius Jacob von, 560  
 Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, 544  
 Henri II, King of France, 406, 429  
 Henri III, 429, 432  
 Henri IV, 432-4, 452  
 Henry II, Emperor, 138-40  
 Henry III, Emperor, 141-6  
 Henry IV, Emperor, 146-51, 178, 238  
 Henry V, Emperor, 151-2, 174-5  
 Henry VI, Emperor, 192-5, 198  
 Henry VII, Emperor, 258-61, 265, 271, 276, 280  
 Henry, King of Germany, son of Frederick II, Emperor, 228, 231  
 Henry the Lion, Duke of Bavaria, 181, 189, 190  
 Henry the Proud, Duke of Bavaria, 177, 181  
 Heraclius, Emperor, 100  
 Heraclius, Emperor of the East, 612  
 Heranic, 79  
 Herbert d'Intimiano, 140-1  
 Herschel, Frederick William, 464  
 Hess, Heinrich, 570  
 Hildebrand, 146-8 (*see* Gregory VII)  
 Hilderic, 75  
 Hitler, Adolf, 626-7  
 Hohenstaufen, *for the kings and emperors of this house, see individual names*  
 Hohenstaufen, Conrad of, Duke of Franconia, 175  
 Hohenstaufen, Frederick of, Duke of Swabia, 175  
 Holbach, Paul-Henri d', 468  
 Holbein, Hans, the younger, 394  
 Honorius I, Pope, 100  
 Honorius II, 148, 175-6  
 Honorius III, 213, 221, 228-9  
 Horatius Flaccus (Horace), 53, 54  
 Hormisdas, Pope, 75  
 Hugh of Provence, 131-33  
 Hugh, Abbot of Cluny, 146  
 Humbert I, King of Italy, 579  
 Humbert I, Biancamano, Count of Moriano, 199  
 Humbert III, 199, 593-4  
 Hume, David, 466  
 Humphrey d'Hauteville, 142-3  
 Huss, John, 326  
 Iba of Edessa, 85  
 Idrisi, 199  
 Ildibad, 79  
 Induno, Domenico, 601  
 Induno, Gerolamo, 601  
 Innocent II, Pope, 175, 177, 179, 190, 256  
 Innocent III, 195-6, 199, 209, 213, 216, 219, 224, 256  
 Innocent IV, 232-5  
 Innocent VI, 295-8  
 Innocent VII, 303, 319  
 Innocent VIII, 347, 365  
 Innocent X, 439, 442  
 Innocent XI, 450  
 Irnerius, 174, 212  
 Isabella the Catholic, Queen of Castile, 360, 367  
 Isabella of Aragon, Duchess of Milan, 365  
 Isaac II, Angelus, Emperor of the East, 224-5  
 Isaac, Exarch, 93  
 Ivo, Bishop of Chartres, 153  
 Jacini, Stefano, 596  
 Jacopo, jurist, 185  
 Jacopo da Varagine, 279  
 Jacopo of Venice, 214  
 Jacopone da Todi, 256, 281  
 Jaime II, King of Sicily, *then* of Aragon, 247  
 Jaime of Majorca, 310  
 Jansenius, Cornelius Jansen, 480  
 Jenner, Edward, 464  
 Jerome, Saint, 65  
 Joanna I (Giovanna), Queen of Naples, 301-3, 308-9  
 Joanna II, 321, 327, 310, 328, 331  
 Joanna, Queen of Aragon, the Mad, 379  
 John, Negus of Abyssinia, 604  
 John of Jandun, 263  
 John I, Pope, 76  
 John III, 86  
 John VIII, 121-3  
 John X, 131  
 John XI, 132  
 John XII, 133-4  
 John XIII, 134  
 John XVI, 136  
 John XIX, 140, 144  
 John XXII, 260, 262, 265, 278, 325  
 John XXIII, 320-1, 325

# INDEX OF NAMES

- John I, Zimisces, Emperor of the East, 135  
 John V, Palaeologus, Emperor of the East, 305  
 John of Anjou, 341-3  
 John II, King of Aragon and of Sicily, 341  
 John of Luxemburg, King of Bohemia, 265-7, 271  
 John Chrysostom, 214  
 John of Damascus, 214  
 Joseph I, Emperor, 455  
 Joseph II, Emperor, 480, 485  
 Joseph, Napoleon Bonaparte, King of Naples, *then* of Spain, 502, 517  
 Joseph I, King of Portugal, 481  
 Josephine Tascher de La Pagerie, Empress of the French, 492  
 Jourdan, G. B., 492  
 Jugurtha, 45  
 Julius Nepos, 65, 68  
 Julius II, Pope, 345, 347, 374-7  
 Julius III, 406-7  
 Junod, Francesco, 489  
 Justin I, Emperor of the East, 75-6  
 Justin II, 89  
 Justinian I, Emperor of the East, 75, 77-8, 80, 83-5, 89  
 Justinian II, 100  
 Juvara, Philip, 476  
 Juvenal, 56  
  
 Kant, Emanuel, 544  
 Kanzler, Rodolfo, 583  
 Kellogg, Frank, 626  
 Kepler, Johann, 448  
 Kulscioff, Anna, 607  
  
 Labriola, Antonio, 601  
 Ladislas, King of Naples, 311, 316, 318-321  
 La Farina, Giuseppe, 567  
 La Fayette, Marie-Joseph de, 530  
 La Feuillade, Louis de, 455  
 Laffitte, Jacques, 530, 531  
 La Fontaine, Jean de, 444  
 Lagrange, Luigi, 464  
 Lamarmora, Alfonso, 577-89  
 Lambert of Spoleto, 129-30  
 Lambert of Tuscany, 131  
 Lambruschini, Card. Luigi, 547  
 Lamoricière, Louis de, 571, 573-4  
 Lampugnani, Gian Andrea, 344  
  
 Lancia, Manfredo, 240  
 Lando, Conrad (Count of Landau), 277, 291  
 Landolfo, 148  
 Laneri, G. B., 526  
 Lanfranc, architect, 172  
 Lanza, Ferdinando, 572  
 Lanza, Giovanni, 577, 583, 589  
 Lanzi, Luigi, 472  
 Lanzone, 142  
 Lasca (Anton Francesco Grazzini), 389  
 Lascaris, Costantino, 349  
 Latini, Brunetto, 281  
 Latino, Card., 244, 251  
 La Tour, Victor de, 523  
 Laurana, Luciano, 353  
 Laurentius, Antipope, 73-4  
 Lauria, Ruggero di, 246  
 Lautrec, Odet de, 382  
 Laval, 627  
 La Valette, Jean de, 412  
 Lavoisier, Antoine, 464  
 Lazzari, Costantino, 607  
 Lefèvre, Jacques (Faber Stapulensis), 357  
 Lega, Silvestro, 601  
 Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm, 449  
 Lelio, 400  
 Leo I, the Great, Pope, 63, 64  
 Leo III, 101, 107-8, 121  
 Leo IV, 120  
 Leo VIII, 134  
 Leo IX, 143, 145-6  
 Leo X, 377-80, 397  
 Leo XII, 528  
 Leo XIII, 593-4, 603, 610  
 Leo III, the Isaurian, Emperor of the East, 101, 107, 121  
 Leonardo da Vinci, 393  
 Leopardi, Giacomo, 544  
 Leopold, Duke of Austria, 306-7  
 Leopold I, Emperor, 454-5  
 Leopold II, Emperor, Peter Leopold, Grand Duke of Tuscany, 548  
 Leopold II, Grand Duke of Tuscany, 512, 562  
 Lepidus, M. Emilius, 52  
 Lesseps, Ferdinand de, 559  
 Leszczyński, Stanislas, King of Poland, 459-60  
 Leutari, 80  
 Liberius, 71

- Linnaeus, Charles**, 464  
**Lippi, Filippino**, 352  
**Lippi, Filippo**, 352  
**Liudolf, son of Otto I**, 133  
**Liutprand, Bishop of Cremona**, 163  
**Liutprand, King of the Longobards**, 101-104  
**Livius Andronicus**, 42  
**Livius, Drusus M.**, 46  
**Livius, Titus (Livy)**, 53, 54  
**Locke, John**, 404-7  
**Lo Giudice, Antonio**, 442  
**Lombardo family**, 354  
**Longhena, Baldassarre**, 447  
**Lope de Vega, Felice**, 444  
**Lorenzetti, Ambrogio**, 285  
**Lorenzetti, Pietro**, 285  
**Lorraine, René of**, 347  
**Lothar I, Emperor**, 116, 118  
**Lothar II, Emperor**, 119-21, 132, 175-7, 180  
**Lothar II, King of Lotharinga**, 119  
**Lothar, son of Hugh of Provence**, 132-3  
**Lotto, Lorenzo**, 394  
**Louis I, the Pious, Emperor**, 117-18  
**Louis II, Emperor**, 118-21  
**Louis IV, the Bavarian, Emperor**, 260, 264-5, 271, 290, 292  
**Louis, of Provence, Emperor**, 130  
**Louis the German, King of Germania**, 118, 122  
**Louis I, King of Etruria**, 499  
**Louis IX, Saint, King of France**, 235, 237, 243, 252  
**Louis XI**, 343  
**Louis XII**, 370-3, 375, 378  
**Louis XIII**, 437  
**Louis XIV**, 442, 450-4, 467  
**Louis XV**, 458-9, 481  
**Louis XVI**, 490  
**Louis XVIII**, 490, 510, 529  
**Louis Bonaparte, King of Holland**, 530, 550  
**Louis of Anjou-Taranto, King of Naples**, 309-10  
**Louis of Aragon, King of Sicily**, 309  
**Louis I of Anjou, King of Hungary**, 280, 308-9  
**Louis I of Anjou, second house**, 305, 308-9, 310-11, 318  
**Louis II of Anjou (id.)**, 311, 318, 320  
**Louis III of Anjou (id.)**, 327  
**Louis Philippe, King of the French**, 529, 531, 550  
**Louise of Savoy, Mother of Francis I of France, Regent of the kingdom**, 381, 383  
**Louisa Maria of Bourbon, Duchess of Parma**, 562  
**Loyola, Saint Ignatius**, 411  
**Lucan**, 56  
**Lucilius, Gaius**, 42  
**Lucius II, Pope**, 179  
**Lucius III**, 192  
**Lucretius**, 53, 349  
**Ludovico IX, Duke of Savoy**, 333  
**Ludovico il Moro, Duke of Milan**, 344, 346, 365-8, 370-1, 377  
**Luini, Bernardino**, 393  
**Luitprand**, 101-3  
**Lulli, G. B.**, 478  
**Lupatelli, Domenico**, 538  
**Lusignan, James of, King of Cyprus**, 307  
**Luther, Martin**, 395, 397-8  
**Luzzatti, Luigi**, 596, 613  
**Lyly, John**, 444  
**Mabillon, Giovanni**  
**Machiavelli, Niccolò**, 375, 389, 390  
**Macclodis**, 323  
**McMahon**, 569, 590, 593  
**Madama Reale, see Christine of France**  
**Maderna, Carlo**, 447  
**Maecenas**, 53  
**Magalotti, Lorenzo**, 476  
**Magellan (Ferdinando Magalhaes)**, 361  
**Magliani, Agostino**, 595, 597  
**Mahomet II**, 340-1  
**Maidalchini, Olimpia**, 439  
**Maione of Bari**, 184, 187  
**Malaspina, Saba**, 279  
**Malatesta, Carlo**, 313  
**Malatesta, Domenico**, 343  
**Malatesta, Pandolfo**, 317  
**Malatesta, Roberto**, 347  
**Malatesta, Sigismondo**, 333, 342-3  
**Mameli, Goffredo**, 541  
**Mamiani della Rovere, Terenzio**, 544, 556  
**Manara, Luciano**, 551-2, 558  
**Mancini, Antonio**, 611  
**Mancini, Pasquale Stanislao**, 590, 591  
**Manfred, Astorre**, 372

# INDEX OF NAMES

Manfred, Giovanni, 296  
 Manfred, King of Sicily, 214, 233-5, 238  
 Manin, Daniele, 551, 554, 560, 567  
 Manin, Ludovico, Doge, 494  
 Manthonè, Gabriele, 498  
 Manuel I Comnenus, Emperor of the East, 184, 188  
 Manutius, Aldus, 358, 387  
 Manzoni, Alessandro, 106, 541  
 Maramaldo, Fabrizio, 385  
 Marcello, Benedetto, 478  
 Marcello, Lorenzo, 443  
 Marcellus II, Pope, 407  
 Marcovald, Duke of Romagna, 194, 197  
 Marcus Aurelius, Emperor, 55, 58  
 Margaret of Austria, daughter of the Emperor Maximilian, 383  
 Margaret of Austria, illegitimate daughter of Charles V, 403, 405  
 Marguerite of France, Duchess of Savoy, 429  
 Maria of Aragon, Queen of Sicily, 321  
 Marie Adelaide of Habsburg, Queen of Sardinia, 546  
 Marie Amelia, of Habsburg, Duchess of Parma, 487  
 Marie Antoinette of Habsburg, Queen of France, 491  
 Marie of Burgundy, Empress, 379  
 Marie Caroline of Habsburg, Queen of the Sicilies, 488, 491, 497  
 Marie Jeanne Baptiste of Savoie-Nemours, Duchess of Savoy, 452  
 Marie Louise of Bourbon, Queen of Etruria, 503, 512  
 Marie Louise of Habsburg, Empress of the French, then Duchess of Parma, 507, 511, 530, 549  
 Marie de Medicis, Queen of France, 434  
 Marie Theresa of Habsburg, Queen of Bohemia and Hungary, 460-2, 488  
 Marillac, Louise de, 410  
 Marino, G. B., 444  
 Marius, Caus, 45-8  
 Marius, Caius, the Younger, 45-8  
 Marochetti, Carlo, 545  
 Maroncelli, Piero, 518, 526-7, 529  
 Marot, Clément, 391  
 Marozia, 130, 132  
 Marsilius of Padua, 263  
 Martial, 56

Martin I the Elder, King of Aragon, 321  
 Martin II the Younger, 321  
 Martin I, Pope, 100  
 Martin IV, 245-6  
 Martin V, 321, 323-4, 326-8  
 Martini, Arturo, 612  
 Martini, Ferdinando, 600, 606  
 Martini, Simon, 285  
 Martinus Gosia, 185  
 Martire d'Anghiera, Pietro, 388  
 Martucci, Giuseppe, 602  
 Maruffi, Fra Silvestro, 370  
 Marx, Karl, 589, 601  
 Masaccio, 352  
 Masaniello (Tommaso Aniello), 440-1  
 Mascagni, Pietro, 602, 612  
 Masci, Filippo, 601  
 Massa, Prince of, 441  
 Massari, Giuseppe, 538  
 Masséna, Andrea, 502  
 Massentius, 56  
 Masuccio, 351  
 Masuccio, Salernitano, 351  
 Matasuntha, 78  
 Matteotti, Giacomo, 622  
 Maurice of Saxony, 406  
 Maximilian I of Habsburg, King of the Romans, 364, 366, 375-6, 378  
 Maximilian I, King of Bavaria, 504  
 Maximilian I Sforza, Duke of Milan, 377, 381  
 Maximinus, 59  
 Maximus, Saint, 65  
 Mazarin, Card. Jules, 441  
 Mazzini, Joseph, 533-9, 558, 561-2, 564-566, 570, 572, 574, 577, 589  
 Mazzoni, Joseph, 557  
 Medici, *for sovereigns and women who married reigning princes, see individual names*  
 Medici, Cosimo de', the Elder, 330-1, 334, 343, 365  
 Medici, Garzia de', 426  
 Medici, Giacomo, Marchese del Vascello, 579  
 Medici, Giovanni de', 330  
 Medici, Giovanni de', *detto delle Bande Nere*, 382, 403  
 Medici, Giovanni de', son of Cosimo I, 426  
 Medici, Giovanni, son of Lorenzo, 348



- Medici, Giuliano de', Duke of Nemours, 344  
 Medici, Giulio de', Card., 379  
 Medici, Lorenzino de', 403  
 Medici, Lorenzo de', the Magnificent, 345-6, 348, 350, 365  
 Medici, Lorenzo di Giovanni de', 330  
 Medici, Lorenzo di Pietro II de', Duke of Urbino, 379  
 Medici, Maddalena de', 348  
 Medici, Piero I de', 343  
 Medici, Piero II de', 365-6, 374  
 Medici, Salvestro de', 307  
 Melancthon, Philip, 395  
 Melas, Michele, 499  
 Melegari, Luigi Amedeo, 591  
 Melo, 139-40, 142  
 Melozzo da Forlì, 354  
 Melzi, Francesco, Duke of Lodi, 500  
 Menabrea, Luigi Federico, 581  
 Mendoza, Diego de, 392  
 Menelik, Negus of Abyssinia, 604-5  
 Menotti, Ciro, 530-1  
 Mercantini, Luigi, 541  
 Metastasio, Pietro, 474  
 Metternich, Prince Wenceslas von, 510, 516, 531, 550  
 Micca, Pietro, 455  
 Michael VIII, Palaeologus, Emperor of the East, 236, 243  
 Michael, Cerularius, 143  
 Michele di Lando, 308  
 Michelozzi, Michelozzo, 353  
 Michetti, Francesco Paolo, 601  
 Michel, Card., 373  
 Milesi, Card., 570  
 Milo, Saint., 123  
 Milton, John, 444  
 Minghetti, Marco, 576-7, 589, 590-1, 594, 596  
 Mino da Fiesole, 351  
 Minocchi, Salvatore, 612  
 Misley, 530  
 Mithridates, 47, 48  
 Mocenigo, Lazzaro, 443  
 Mocenigo, Leonardo, 443  
 Molière (J. B. Poquelin), 444  
 Moneta of Cremona, 220, 271  
 Montaigne, Michel de, 444  
 Montaldo, Leonardo da, 307  
 Montanari, Leonida, 528  
 Montanelli, Giuseppe, 557  
 Montano, Nicolò, 344  
 Montecchi, Mattia, 557, 561  
 Montefeltro, Count Federico di, 292  
 Montefeltro, Federico da, Duke of Urbino, 345  
 Montefeltro, Guidobaldo di, Duke of Urbino, 372-3, 379  
 Montemar, 459  
 Montesquieu, Charles de, 468  
 Monteverde, Giulio, 612  
 Monteverdi, Claudio, 446, 478  
 Monti, Vincenzo, 493, 503  
 Montmorency, Anne de, 407  
 Mordini, Antonio, 573  
 More, Thomas, 357  
 Moreau, Jean-Victor, 492, 499  
 Morelli, Domenico, 601  
 Morelli, Michele, 520, 525  
 Morena, Acerbo, 210  
 Morena, Ottone, 210  
 Moriale, Fra., 277, 287, 295  
 Morichini, Card. Carlo Luigi, 554  
 Moro, Domenico, 538  
 Morone, Card. Giovanni, 399  
 Morone, Gerolamo, 381  
 Morosini, Francesco, 453  
 Moses of Bergamo, 210, 214  
 Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus, 479  
 Murat, Joachim, King of Naples, 502, 504-6, 517, 520  
 Murat, Lucien, 566  
 Muratori, Ludovico Antonio, 472  
 Murri, Romolo, 610  
 Musa, 169  
 Musolino, Benedetto, 538  
 Mussato, Albertino, 280  
 Mussolini, Benito, 616-17, 622-4, 627-8  
 Muzio Attendolo, 320  
 Napoleon, Prince Jerome, 568-9  
 Napoleon I, Emperor of the French, Napoleon Bonaparte, 491-509, 511, 519-20  
 Napoleon III, Emperor of the French, Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, 530, 550, 559, 562, 565, 567, 571, 573, 578, 880-4  
 Narses, 80, 89  
 Navagero, Andrea, 387  
 Needham, John, 464  
 Neipperg, Adam von, 511

# INDEX OF NAMES

- Nelson, Horatio, 497-8  
 Nepos, Julius, Emperor, 65, 68  
 Neri, Pompeo, 486  
 Neri, St. Philip, 410  
 Nero, 55, 61  
 Nerva, 55, 57  
 NeuhoF, Theodore von, 483  
 Nevius, 42  
 Newton, Isaac, 449, 467  
 Niccolini, G. B., 542  
 Nicephorus I, Emperor of the East, 110  
 Nicephorus II, Phocas, 135  
 Nicholas I, Pope, 119, 121, 149  
 Nicholas II, 146-8, 172  
 Nicholas III, 244, 256  
 Nicholas IV, 255  
 Nicholas V, 335, 341, 430  
 Nicholas V, Antipope, 264  
 Nicholas I, Tsar of Russia, 566  
 Nicolò (sculptor), 208  
 Nicolò di Jamsilla, 279  
 Nicotera, Giovanni, 591, 594, 604  
 Nievo, Ippolito, 598  
 Nilus, Saint, 137, 145  
 Nitti, Francesco Saverio, 621  
 Nogaret, Guillaume de, 257  
 Nugent, Laval, 505, 553, 560  
  
 Occam, William of, 263  
 Ochino, Bernardino, 398-9  
 Octavius, Caus, 51, *see* Augustus  
 Odilon, Abbot of Cluny, 145  
 Odo, of Savoy, 199  
 Odoacer, 65-74, 81, 89  
 Odoardo, Farnese, Duke of Parma, 439  
 Odofredo of Bologna, 278  
 O'Donnell, 551  
 Ognibono of Bologna, 213  
 Oldrado, 219  
 Olgiati, Gerolamo, 344  
 Oliverotto da Fermo, 373  
 Oñate, Count of, 441  
 Orange, Philibert, Prince of, 384-5  
 Orcagna (Andrea di Cione), 286  
 Ordelaffi, Francesco, 296  
 Orestes, father of Romulus Augustulus, 65, 66  
 Oriani, Alfredo, 599  
 Orlando, Vittorio Emanuele, 618  
 Orléans, Charles, Duke of  
 Orléans, Louis, Duke of, 313  
  
 Oroboni, Antonio, 527  
 Orseolo, Pietro II, Doge, 170  
 Orsini, Card. G. B., 373  
 Orsini, Felice, 567  
 Orsini, Francesco, 373  
 Orsini, Paolo, 373  
 Ossuna, Duke of, 440  
 Ottavio, Farnese, Duke of Parma, 405-6, 408  
 Otto I, Emperor, 132-5, 138  
 Otto II, Emperor, 135-6  
 Otto III, Emperor, 136-8  
 Otto IV, Emperor, 195-8  
 Otto Brunswick, husband of Joanna I of Naples, 310  
 Ottobuono Terzo, 317  
 Oudinot, Vittorio, 559  
 Ovid, 53  
  
 Pagano, Mario, 488, 497-8  
 Paisiello, Giovanni, 478  
 Paleario, Antonio, 410  
 Palestrina, 478  
 Palizzi, Filippo, 601  
 Palladio, Andrea, 446  
 Pallavicini, Emilio, 576  
 Pallavicino, Giorgio, 526-7  
 Pallavicino, Sforza, 445  
 Palma, Jacopo, the Elder, 394  
 Palmerston, Lord, 554  
 Pandulph IV, of Capua, 142  
 Pandulph, Testa di Ferro, 135  
 Panormita, Antonio Beccadelli, *detto* il, 350  
 Pantaleoni, Diomede, 575  
 Paoli, Pasquale, 483, 491-2  
 Papirius, 47  
 Paracelsus (Bombastes von Hohenheim), 395  
 Parini, Giuseppe, 475  
 Parisio di Cereta, 279  
 Parmenides, 20  
 Paruta, Paolo, 445  
 Pascal I, Pope, 118  
 Pascal II, 151-2  
 Pascal III, Antipope, 182, 187-8  
 Pascarella, Cesare, 600  
 Pascoli, Giovanni, 611  
 Passaglia, p. Carlo, 575  
 Passavanti, Jacopo, 283  
 Passeggeri, Rolandino, 278

- Paul I, Pope, 104-5  
 Paul II, 336, 340, 345  
 Paul III, 399, 401-2, 405, 411  
 Paul IV, 407-9, 423  
 Paul V, 408, 433-4  
 Paul I, Tsar of Russia, 498  
 Paul, Exarch, 101  
 Paul, Deacon, 116  
 Paul, Saint, 98  
 Paulinus of Aquileia, 116  
 Paulinus, St., 65  
 Pazzi family, 345-6  
 Pedro II, of Aragon, King of Sicily, 235  
 Pedro III, King of Aragon, 246  
 Pedro IV, King of Aragon, 271, 288, 321  
 Pedro of Eboli, 210  
 Pelagius I, Pope, 85-6  
 Pelagius, Alvaro, 264  
 Pelavicini, Oberto, 234, 240, 242  
 Pellico, Silvio, 518, 525, 527, 542  
 Peloux, Luigi, 607  
 Pelosa, Nino della, 441  
 Pepe, Florestano, 521  
 Pepe, Guglielmo, 520, 522, 525, 529, 553,  
 560  
 Pergolesi, G. B., 478  
 Peri, Jacopo, 446  
 Persano, Carlo Pession di, 574, 579  
 Persius, 56  
 Pertarius, 94  
 Perugino, Pietro, 354, 393  
 Peruzzi, Baldassare, 392  
 Pesce, Giuseppe, 442  
 Peter Chrysologus, Saint, 64  
 Peter Lombard, 175, 209, 278  
 Peter of Pisa, 116  
 Peter, Saint, 98  
 Peter the Hermit, 154  
 Petrarch, Francesco, 282-4, 294, 349  
 Petronius Arbitrator, 56  
 Petrucci, Card. Alfonso, 379  
 Petrucci, Pandolfo, 372  
 Phalaris, 19  
 Philip of Achaia, 249  
 Philip, Emperor, 60  
 Philip of Hohenstaufen, King of Germany,  
 197  
 Philip II, Augustus, King of France, 195  
 Philip of Swabia, 194-5, 224  
 Philip III, the Bold, 247  
 Philip IV, the Fair, 247, 256, 257-9  
 Philip I, King of Castile, 364, 379  
 Philip II, King of Spain, 402, 407-9, 412,  
 433  
 Philip IV, 441  
 Philip V, 454-6, 458  
 Philip, Duke of Parma, 460-2  
 Philolaus, 20  
 Pianelli, Giuseppe Salvatore, 579  
 Piccinino, Jacopo, 342-3  
 Piccinino, Nicolò, 323, 329, 331, 333  
 Piccolomini, Antonio, 351  
 Pico della Mirandola, 356  
 Pier delle Vigne, 233, 280  
 Pier, Luigi Farnese, Duke of Parma, 405  
 Piermarini, Giuseppe, 477  
 Pietro di Musanda, 213  
 Pilo, Rosalino, 572  
 Pimentel, Eleanora, 498  
 Pindar, 444  
 Pinturicchio, Bernardo Betti, *detto il*, 354,  
 393  
 Piombo, Sebastiano del, 394  
 Pippin the Short, 103-5  
 Pippin, son of Charlemagne, 106, 110-11,  
 117  
 Piranesi, 477  
 Pisacane, Carlo, 566-7  
 Pisanello (Vittore Pisano), 354  
 Pisani, Giorgio, 482  
 Pisani, Nicolò, 288  
 Pisani, Vittor, 306  
 Pisano, Andrea, 285  
 Pisano, Giovanni, 285  
 Pisano, Nicolò, 285  
 Pitti, Luca, 343  
 Pius II, Pope, 340, 342, 345, 350  
 Pius III, 374  
 Pius V, 410, 412, 424, 426  
 Pius VI, 485, 494-6  
 Pius VII, 503, 505, 513, 528  
 Pius VIII, 528  
 Pius IX, 547-9, 554, 556, 562, 577, 582-4,  
 590, 593-4  
 Pius X, 610  
 Pius XI, 625  
 Pizzarro, Francesco, 361  
 Plato, 355-6, 449  
 Plautius, 47  
 Plautus, T. Maccius, 42, 349  
 Pletho, Giorgio Gemisto, *detto*, 349  
 Pliny, the Elder, 56

# INDEX OF NAMES

- Pliny, the Younger, 56  
 Poerio, Carlo, 538, 563  
 Poggetto, Card. Bertrando del, 261, 266–267, 292  
 Pole, Reginald, Card., 399  
 Politian, Angelo Ambrogini, *detto il*, 350, 389  
 Pollauolo, Antonio, 351–2  
 Polo, Marco, 280  
 Polosa, Nino della, 441  
 Pombal, Sebastian, Marquess of, 481  
 Pompey, 48, 50, 51  
 Pomponazzi, Pietro, 355  
 Pontano, Giovanni, 350  
 Porcari, Stefano, 335–6  
 Porpora, Nicolò, 478  
 Porro, Lambertenghi, Luigi, 518, 529  
 Porsenna, 25  
 Pozzo, Andrea, 447  
 Praga, Emilio, 597  
 Praga, Marco, 599  
 Prati, Giovanni, 597  
 Predari, Francesco, 547  
 Previali, Gaetano, 611  
 Prina, Giuseppe, 505  
 Prinetti, Giulio, 614  
 Propertius, 53  
 Protogoras, 20  
 Provana, Andrea, 413  
*Pseudo-Dionysian Areopagite*, 209  
*Pseudo-Isidore (Isidor Mercator)*, 127  
 Ptolemy, 214  
 Ptolemy of Lucca, 278  
 Pucci, Orazio, 426  
 Puccini, Giacomo, 602, 612  
 Pulci, Luigi, 351  
 Puoti, Basilio, 543  
 Pusterla, Francesco da, 286  
 Pyrrhus, 32  
 Pythagoras, 19  
  
 Quercia, Jacopo della, 351  
 Querini, Angelo, 482  
 Quintilian, 56, 349  
  
 Rabelais, François, 391  
 Racine, Jean, 444  
 Radelchi of Benevento, 120  
 Radetzky, Josef Wenceslas, 551, 553–4, 557–8, 561  
 Rainaldo, architect, 172  
  
 Rainulf of Aversa, 142  
 Ramorino, Gerolamo, 536, 557  
 Rampolla, Card., 424, 603  
 Ranuccio II, Farnese, Duke of Parma, 440  
 Raphael, Sanzio, 354, 392–3  
 Rattazzi, Urbano, 557, 563, 576–7, 580, 589, 590  
 Realdo Colombo, Matteo, 395  
 Redi, Francesco, 445  
 Regaldi, Giuseppe, 597  
 Regis, Michele, 522  
 René of Anjou, 328, 331–2, 334–5, 341  
 Reni, Guido, 447  
 Respighi, Ottorino, 612  
 Reuchlin, 357  
 Riario, Gerolamo, 345, 371  
 Riario, Pietro, 345  
 Ricasoli, Bettino, 558, 571, 575–6, 578, 580  
 Ricci, Scipione de', 486  
 Ricciotti, Nicola, 538  
 Riccotti, Cesare, 589  
 Richard Cœur de Lion, King of England, 193  
 Richard of Aversa, Prince of Capua, 143, 147  
 Richelieu, Card. Armande de, 437, 441  
 Ricimer, 65  
 Rinuccini, Ottavio, 446  
 Rivarola, Card., 528  
 Rizzo, Antonio, 353–4  
 Robbia, Luca della, 352  
 Robert, Elector Palatine, King of the Romans, 314  
 Robert, King of Naples, 259–261, 270–1, 287, 293, 308  
 Robert II, King of France, 140  
 Robert, *detto* Guiscard, Duke of Apulia and Calabria, 143, 147, 149–51, 176, 178  
 Robert, Prince of Capua, 184  
 Robert, Duke of Parma, 562  
 Roberti, Ercole di, 355  
 Roberto dei conti di Ginevra, Card., 301–2  
 Robilant, Carlo Felice Nicolis di, 602  
 Roger I, Count of Sicily, 143, 176  
 Roger II, King of Sicily, 176–8, 183, 192, 194, 208  
 Roger d'Hauteville, son of William I, 143  
 Roger of Palermo, 213

- Rolandino of Padua, 279  
 Rolandis, G. B. de, 489  
 Rolli, Paolo, 474  
 Romagnosi, Giandomenico, 526  
 Romano, Egidio, 278  
 Romano, Ezzelino II da, 198  
 Romano, Ezzelino III da, 230, 233-4, 340  
 Romano, Liborio, 573  
 Romuald, 213  
 Romuald, Saint, 137, 145  
 Romuald II, Bishop of Salerno, 211  
 Romulus Augustulus, Emperor, 65-67  
 Romussi, Carlo, 607  
 Ronsard, Pierre de, 391, 444  
 Rosa, Salvator, 447  
 Rosmini Serbati, Antonio, 544  
 Rossellino, Antonio, 352  
 Rossellino, Bernardo, 351  
 Rossetti, Gabriele, 541  
 Rossi, Pellegrino, 556  
 Rossini, Joachim, 545  
 Rosso, Medardo, 612  
 Rothari, 93, 96  
 Rouher, Eugène, 581  
 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 469-70, 517  
 Rovani, Giuseppe, 598  
 Rovere, Francesco Maria della, Duke of Urbino, 378, 380, 382, 439  
 Rovere, Giovanni della, 345  
 Rovere, Giuliano della, *see* Julius II  
 Rovetta, Gerolamo, 598-9  
 Rucellai, Giovanni, 389  
 Rucellai, Giulio, 486  
 Rudini, Antonio di, 604, 606-7  
 Rudolph, King of Upper Burgundy and Emperor, 131  
 Rudolph of Habsburg, King of Germany, 243  
 Rudolph of Swabia, 150  
 Ruffini, Giovanni, 535  
 Ruffini, Jacopo, 535-6  
 Ruffo, Card. Fabrizio, 497  
 Ruggero degli Abaldini, 251  
 Russo, Vincenzo, 498  
 Ruysbroek, 326  
 Sabatelli, Luigi, 545  
 Sacchetti, Franco, 283  
 Sacconi, Raniero, 220  
 Sadoletto, Jacopo, 399  
 Saffi, Aurelio, 558, 561  
 Saint-Gelais, Mellin de, 391  
 Salandra, Antonio, 616-18  
 Salasco, Carlo di, 555  
*Salernus, magister*, 213  
 Saliceti, Aurelio, 557  
 Saliceti, Guglielmo, 278  
 Salimbene of Parma, 279  
 Salinguerra, 198  
 Sallustius, Crispus (Salluot), 53  
 Salutati, Coluccio, 349  
 Salvemini, Gaetano, 612  
 Salvi, Nicolò, 476  
 Salviati, Francesco, 345-6  
 Sempiero di Bastalica, 428  
 Sangallo, Antonio, the Younger, 392  
 San Marzano, Alessandro Asinari di, 603  
 San Marzano, Carlo Asinari di, 522  
 Sanmicheli, Michele, 392  
 Sannazzaro, Jacopo, 351, 387  
 Sansovino, Jacopo, 392  
 Sansverino, Antonio, 347  
 Santa Rosa, Santorre di, 522-4, 526  
 Sanzio, Raffaello, *see* Raphael  
 Saracco, Giuseppe, 607  
 Sarpi, Fra Paolo, 434, 445  
 Sarto, Andrea del, 393  
 Sartorio, Giulio Aristide, 611  
 Saturninus, Apuleius, 46  
 Saviozzo, Simone Serdini, *detto il*, 283  
 Savoie-Carignan, Eugene of, 452-3, 454-455, 457, 571  
 Savoie-Carignan, Eugene of, 571  
 Savonarola, Gerolamo, 365, 368-70, 383  
 Savoy, *for sovereigns and women of the House of Savoy who married reigning princes, see individual names*  
 Savoy, Card. Maurice of, 438  
 Savoy, Clotilde of, 568  
 Savoy, Ferdinand of, Duke of Genoa  
 Savoy, Thomas of, Prince of Carignano, 438  
 Scala, Alberto I della, 249  
 Scala, Alberto II della, 267  
 Scala, Alboino della, 250, 259  
 Scala, Bartolomeo della, 250  
 Scala, Can Grande della, 259, 261  
 Scala, Cansignore della, 297  
 Scala, Mastino I della, 240, 249  
 Scala, Mastino II della, 266-7  
 Scarlatti, Alessandro, 478  
 Scipio Africanus, 42

# INDEX OF NAMES

- Scipio Emilianus, 42  
 Scott, Walter, 542  
 Segantini, Giovanni, 601  
 Segneri, Paolo, 446  
 Selim I, Sultan of the Turks, 401  
 Selim II, 413  
 Sella, Quintino, 577  
 Senebier, 464  
 Seneca, 54, 56  
 Septimus Severus, 55, 59, 60  
 Serafino Aquilano, 350  
 Serao, Matilde, 598  
 Sergius I, Pope, 100  
 Servetus, Michael, 395, 400  
 Servius Tullius, 22  
 Settembrini, Luigi, 538, 563, 597  
 Sforza, for the Dukes of Milan, *see individual names*  
 Sforza, Carlo, 620  
 Sforza, Caterina, 345, 371  
 Sforza, Francesco, 323, 329, 332-4  
 Sforza, Galeazzo Maria, Duke of Bari, 344, 346  
 Sforza, Giovanni, Signore of Pesaro, 365  
 Sforza, Io (Muzio Attendolo), 320-1, 327  
 Sgambati, Giovanni, 602  
 Shakespeare, William, 444  
 Sicard, Bishop of Cremona, 210, 213  
 Sicard, Prima of Benevento, 119  
 Siccardi, Giuseppe, 563  
 Siconolf, Prince of Benevento, 119  
 Sigismond of Burgundy, 74  
 Sigismond of Luxemburg, King of Hungary, Emperor, 316, 318, 321-2, 328, 336  
 Signorelli, Luca, 354  
 Signorini, Telemaco, 601  
 Sigonio, Carlo, 387  
 Silius Italicus, 56  
 Silvati, Giuseppe, 520, 525  
 Silverius, Pope, 78, 84  
 Simonetta, Cicco, 344, 346  
 Sismondi, Cinzica dei, 169  
 Sixtus IV, Pope, 340, 345-6  
 Sixtus V, 424, 433  
 Smith, Adam, 470  
 Sobieski, John, King of Poland, 453  
 Socinus, Faustus, 400  
 Socinus, Lelius, 400  
 Soderini, Nicolò, 344  
 Soderini, Piero, 375  
 Solaro della Margherita, Clemente, 546  
 Soliman the Magnificent, Sultan of the Turks, 401, 403, 412  
 Sonnino, Sidney, 596, 605, 613, 616-17  
 Sophronius, 20  
 Spadini, Armando, 611  
 Spagna Musa, 169  
 Spallanzani, Lazzaro, 464, 476  
 Spaventa, Bertrando, 591, 601  
 Spaventa, Silvio, 563  
 Specchi, 476  
 Sperti, Tito, 561  
 Speroni, Sperone, 389  
 Spigno, contessa di, 484  
 Spinola, Obizzo, 250  
 Spontini, Gaspare, 545  
 Squarcione, Francesco, 354  
 Stampa, Gaspara, 388  
 Statius, Papinius, 56, 349  
 Stefanis, Francesco de, 489  
 Stephen II, Pope, 105  
 Stephen III, 105  
 Stephen V, 129  
 Stephen IX, 146  
 Sterbini, Pietro, 556  
 Stesichorus, 20  
 Strabo, 47  
 Strozzi, Filippo, 402-3  
 Strozzi, Piero, 406  
 Suetonius Tranquillus, 56  
 Suffi, 590  
 Sulla, 47, 48  
 Surrey, Earl of, 392  
 Suzo, 280  
 Sylvester I, Pope, 104  
 Sylvester II, 137  
 Sylvester III, Antipope, 144  
 Symmachus, 76  
 Symmachus, Pope, 73-4  
 Tacitus, 54, 56  
 Talenti, Francesco, 284  
 Tancred, Count of Lecce, King of Sicily, 193  
 Tancred d'Hauteville, 155  
 Tansillo, Luigi, 389  
 Tanucci, Bernardo, 488, 525  
 Targhini, Angelo, 528  
 Tari, Antonio, 601  
 Tarquinius Priscus, 22

- Tarquinius Superbus, 22  
 Tartaglia, Nicolò, 395  
 Tasso, Bernardo, 388  
 Tasso, Torquato, 388, 390  
 Tassoni, Alessandro, 445  
 Tavani, Giuditta, 581  
 Tazzoli, Don Enrico, 501  
 Tebaldeo, Antonio, 350  
 Tebaldeschi, Card. Francesco, 302  
 Tegetthoff, 579  
 Teias, 80  
 Telesio, Bernardino, 449  
 Tenda, Beatrice di, 318, 322  
 Tenerani, Pietro, 545  
 Terence, 42  
 Terzo, Ottobuono, 317  
 Testi, Fulvio, 444  
 Theodatus, 77-8  
 Theodolinda, Queen of the Longobards, 92-3, 117  
 Theodora, Empress of the East, 84  
 Theodora, daughter of Theophylactus, 130  
 Theodora, wife of Theophylactus, 130  
 Theodore of Mopsuestra, 85  
 Theodore Paleologus, Marquis of Monferrato, 249, 259  
 Theodore of Cyrrhus, 85  
 Theodoric, 67-74, 81  
 Theodosius I, Emperor, 63, 65  
 Theophano, Empress, 135-6  
 Theophylactus, 130  
 Thiers, Adolphe, 590  
 Thomas III of Savoy, Count of Savoy, 199, 229, 248  
 Thomas of Savoy-Carignan, Prince, 438, 441, 452  
 Thorvaldsen, Albert, 545  
 Thrasonond, 74  
 Tiberius, 55  
 Tibullus, 53  
 Tiepolo, Baiamonte, 255, 289  
 Tiepolo, G. B., 477  
 Timoleon, 25  
 Tindal, Matthew, 466  
 Tintoretto (Jacopo Robusti), 394  
 Tiraboschi, Gerolamo, 472  
 Titian (Tiziano Vecellio), 394  
 Tito, Ettore, 611  
 Titus, Emperor, 55  
 Toland, John, 466  
 Tommaseo, Nicolò, 543, 551, 560  
 Tommaso di Celano, 229  
 Tommaso of Modena, 286  
 Torre, Filippo della, 240  
 Torre, Guido della, 249  
 Torre, Martino della, 239-40  
 Torre, Napoleone della, 240, 242-3  
 Torre, Pagano della, 239  
 Torre, Pagano della, Patriarch of Aquileia, 261  
 Torre, Raffaele della, 451  
 Torricelli, Evangelista, 448  
 Toscanelli, Paolo del Pozzo, 360  
 Toselli, Pietro, 605  
 Totila (Baduila), 79-81, 89  
 Toulouse, Canon of, 210  
 Trajanus, Emperor of, 55, 57, 58  
 Tribonian, 77  
 Trionfo, Agostino, 264  
 Trissino, Gian Giorgio, 389  
 Trivulzio, Gian Giacomo, 371, 376, 378  
 Troya, Carlo, 542  
 Tura, Cosmè, 355  
 Turati, Filippo, 605, 607, 609  
 Ubaldi, Baldo degli, 264  
 Ubaldini, Ruggero degli, 251  
 Uberti, Fazio degli, 283  
 Ugo da Prato, 278  
 Ugo of Bologna, 211  
 Ugo, jurist, 185  
 Uguccione, Bishop of Ferrara, 213  
 Uraias, 79  
 Urban, Karl, 569  
 Urban II, Pope, 151, 154  
 Urban III, 192  
 Urban IV, 235  
 Urban V, 258, 298, 300  
 Urban VI, 302-4, 307, 310, 318  
 Urban VIII, 438-9  
 Urslingen, Werner von, 277  
 Ussi, Stefano, 601  
 Uzzano, Nicolò da, 330  
 Vachero, G. Cesare, 437  
 Valdés, Giovanni di, 398  
 Valentinian III, Emperor, 63, 83  
 Valla, Lorenzo, 349, 356  
 Valois, Charles of, 247, 256, 258  
 Vanvitelli, Luigi, 476

# INDEX OF NAMES

- Varano, Giulio Cesare, 372  
 Varignana, Guglielmo, 278  
 Vasari, Giorgio, 390  
 Vasco da Gama, 360  
 Vasco, G. B., 471  
 Vasto, Marquis of, 384  
 Vela, Vincenzo, 545  
 Vendôme, Louis Josephe, Duc de, 454  
 Venier, Sebastiano, 413  
 Venvitelli, Luigi, 476  
 Verdi, Giuseppe, 546, 602  
 Verga, Giovanni, 598  
 Vergerio, Pier Paolo, 398  
 Verme, Jacopo del, 313, 315, 317  
 Vermigli, Pietro Martire, 398-9  
 Veronese, Paolo Calari, *detto*, 394  
 Verrì, Pietro, 471, 473  
 Verrocchio, Andrea del, 351-2  
 Vesalius, 395  
 Vespasian, Emperor, 55, 58  
 Vespasiano da Bisticci, 351  
 Vespucçi, Amerigo, 361  
 Vettori, Pier, 387  
 Vicini, Giovanni, 530  
 Vico, G. B., 472  
 Vico, Prefettodi, 295, 302, 328  
 Victor II, Pope, 145-6  
 Victor IV, Antupope, 186-7  
 Victor Amedeus I, Duke of Savoy, 437-8  
 Victor Amedeus II, *first* Duke of Savoy,  
*then* King of Sicily, *lastly* of Sar-  
 dinia, 452-6, 458-9, 583  
 Victor Amedeus III, 484, 490-2  
 Victor Emmanuel I, King of Sardinia, 505,  
 510-11, 522-3  
 Victor Emmanuel II, *first* Duke of Savoy,  
 King of Sardinia, *then* King of Italy,  
 535, 546, 558, 563-70, 573-4  
 Victor Emmanuel III, 578, 583, 591, 593  
 Viesseux, Giampietro, 543  
 Vigilus, Pope, 84-5  
 Vignola, Jacopo Barozzi, *detto* il, 446  
 Viligelmo, 208  
 Villani, Filippo, 283  
 Villani, Giovanni, 283  
 Villani, Matteo, 283  
 Villari, Pasquale, 600  
 Villars, Louis-Hector, 459  
 Villehardouhin, Isabelle de, 243  
 Villeroi, François duc de, 454  
 Vincent de Paul, Saint, 410  
 Vincenzo Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua, 436  
 Violante di Monferrato, Empress of the  
 East, 249  
 Virgil, 54, 55  
 Virgilio, Giovanni del, 280  
 Visconti, *for the Dukes of Milan, see*  
*individual names*  
 Visconti, Azzone, 212, 265-7, 268, 286  
 Visconti, Bianca, wife of Francesco I,  
 Sforza, 332  
 Visconti, Bernabò, 288, 290, 297-9, 301-2,  
 304, 306, 315  
 Visconti, Carlo, 344  
 Visconti, Caterina, 268, 315  
 Visconti di Oleggio, Giovanni, 290  
 Visconti, Filippo Maria, 317-18, 322, 324,  
 328, 332-3  
 Visconti, Gabriele, 315-16  
 Visconti, Galeazzo I, 262, 264-5  
 Visconti, Galeazzo II, 288, 290, 297-8,  
 300, 302, 304-5  
 Visconti, Gian Galiazzo, 304, 312-20,  
 353  
 Visconti, Giovanni, 261, 268, 286-8  
 Visconti, Giovanni Maria, 315, 317  
 Visconti, Giovanni di Oleggio, 290-1  
 Visconti, Lodrisio, 264, 268, 271  
 Visconti, Luchino, 264, 268, 286  
 Visconti, Marco, 260, 264, 268, 271  
 Visconti, Matteo I, 248-9, 253, 259, 260-2  
 Visconti, Matteo II, 288, 290  
 Visconti, Ottone, 244, 248  
 Visconti, Valentina, 370  
 Visconti Venosta, Emilio, 591, 614  
 Vitelleschi, Giovanni, Card., 329-32  
 Vitelli, Vitellozzo, 372-3  
 Vitiges, 78-9  
 Vochieri, Andrea, 538, 622, 627  
 Volpe, Gioacchino, 612  
 Voltaire, François-Marie Arouet, *detto*,  
 467-8, 470  
 Wagner, Richard, 602  
 Waldo, Peter, 217  
 Waldsee-Muller, Martin, 361  
 Walewski, Count Alexander, 566  
 Walter of Brienne, Duke of Athens, 196,  
 262, 268-70  
 Watteau, Antoine, 477  
 Wenceslas, Emperor, 304, 313-14  
 Wildt, 612



## A CONCISE HISTORY OF ITALY

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>William I, the Bad, King of Sicily, 183-4,<br/>187</p> <p>William I, of Prussia, Emperor of Ger-<br/>many, 578</p> <p>William II, the Good, 187, 190-93, 245</p> <p>William III, 193</p> <p>William III, of Orange, King of England,<br/>454</p> <p>William V, of Aquitaine, 140</p> <p>William d'Hauteville, 142-3</p> <p>Wilson, Woodrow, 620</p> <p>Winckelmann, Joh. Joachim, 477</p> <p>Wurmser, Dagobert Siegmund, 493</p> <p>Wyatt, Thomas, 392</p> <p>Wychiffe, John, 326</p> <p>Xenophon, 20</p> | <p>Zacharias, Pope, 102</p> <p>Zaleucus, 19</p> <p>Zamboni, Luigi, 489</p> <p>Zanardelli, Giuseppe, 592, 594, 604, 607,<br/>613</p> <p>Zanchi, Gerolamo, 398</p> <p>Zandonai, Riccardo, 612</p> <p>Zanella, Giacomo, 597</p> <p>Zeno, Apostolo, 472-3</p> <p>Zeno, Carlo, Admiral, 306</p> <p>Zeno, Carlo, Minister of Gian Galeazzo<br/>Visconti, 314</p> <p>Zeno, Emperor of the East, 67-9</p> <p>Zeno, Saint, 64</p> <p>Zeuxis, 20</p> <p>Zucchi, Carlo, 531, 552</p> |
|--|---|







UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY



127 716

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY

